FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Central Eurasia

Sixth Russian Congress of People's Deputies

FBIS-SOV-92-078-S
Wednesday
22 April 1992

Central Eurasia
SUPPLEMENT
Sixth Russian Congress of People's Deputies

FBIS-SOV-92-078-S 22 April 1992

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

PEOPLE'S CONGRESS PROCEEDINGS

16 April

Faction Leader Temirov Calls For Commonsense *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 16 Apr]* 1

17 April

Newspaper Publishes Khasbulatov Report *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 18 Apr]* 1
Communists Introduce Draft Constitution *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 17 Apr]* 7

18 April

Congress Proceedings for 18 Apr Reported *[Radio Rossii]* 8
Khasbulatov Appeals to Deputies *[Radio Rossii]* 12
Shumeyko Reads Constitutional Resolution *[Radio Rossii]* 13
Further on Constitutional Debate *[ITAR-TASS]* 14
Kozyrev Addresses Congress *[Radio Rossii]* ..... 1[illegible]
Kozyrev Answers Questions *[Radio Rossii]* ..... [illegible]
Shokhin, Shumeyko Cited on Cabinet Changes *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 18 Apr]* 21
Kozyrev Interviewed on Dniester Issue *[Moscow TV]* 22
Deputy Calls For Army of 1.5 Million *[Russian TV]* 23
Council Appeal on Servicemen's Group Circulated *[ITAR-TASS]* 23
Report on CIS Economic Role Distributed *[ITAR-TASS]* 23
Report on Citizenship Issues Circulated *[ITAR-TASS]* 24
Report on Growing Migration Problem Noted *[ITAR-TASS]* 24
Factions Group Considers Replacing Khasbulatov *[Moscow Radio]* 24
Factions Support Congress Rehabilitation *[INTERFAX]* 25
Shakhray on Yeltsin Nonappearance at Session *[INTERFAX]* 25
Line on Media 'Nostalgic' for Agitprop *[IZVESTIYA 18 Apr]* 25
Comparison of Shumeyko Address to Congress *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 18 Apr]* 26

19 April

Three Main Parliamentary Blocs Formed *[Moscow TV]* 26
Deputy Leaves 'Obsolete', Expensive Congress *[ITAR-TASS]* 26

20 April

Congress Proceedings of 20 Apr Session 26
Morning, Afternoon Sessions *[Radio Rossii]* 26
Evening Session *[Radio Rossii]* 28
Kozyrev Addresses Congress *[Radio Rossii]* 29
Khasbulatov Addresses Congress *[Radio Rossii]* 30
Yarov Addresses Congress *[Radio Rossii]* 32
Kuramin Addresses Congress on North *[Radio Rossii]* 32
Deputies Consider Draft Resolutions *[ITAR-TASS]* 37
Details of Congress Discussion on CIS Reported *[ITAR-TASS]* 37
Deputies Recognize CIS *[ITAR-TASS]* 38
Further on Resolution *[ITAR-TASS]* 39
Supreme Soviet Empowered To Prepare Address *[INTERFAX]* 39

Yeltsin Meets With Factions Representatives *[Moscow TV]* 39
Yeltsin Concerned About Resolution *[INTERFAX]* 40
Yeltsin Wins 'Round Two' Against Opposition *[IZVESTIYA 20 Apr]* 40
President Requests Right To Appoint Bank Head *[INTERFAX]* 41
Shakhray on 'Paralysis of Power' at Congress *[INTERFAX]* 41
Poltaranin Interviewed on Freedom of Press *[Moscow TV]* 41
Rumyantsev on Congressional Role, Constitution *[ITAR-TASS]* 42
'Free Russia' Leaves Reform Coalition *[INTERFAX]* 42
Yeltsin Team Accused of 'Discrediting' Government *[ITAR-TASS]* 42
Factional Alignment in Congress Outlined *[Moscow TV]* 43

16 April

Faction Leader Temirov Calls For Commonsense

PM2104113792 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 16 Apr 92 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Umar Temirov, leader of the "Sovereignty and Equality" faction, by parliamentary observer Aleksandr Linkov; place and date not given: "Adopting Commonsense Positions"—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] The delegates to the Sixth Congress have clashed. The "Russian Unity" opposition is stating unequivocally and insisting on the government's resignation. The radical democratic flank is categorically rejecting its opponents' positions and linking the country's future salvation solely with the present cabinet of ministers. Is there some compromise in this seemingly hopeless situation into which the Congress has driven itself?

That was the subject of my talk with Umar Temirov, leader of the "Sovereignty and Unity" faction.

[Temirov] Our faction has always occupied and continues to occupy a commonsense position. It supporters a particular bloc if its representatives have also discussed in a balanced manner the situation which has arisen and are trying to find a way out by seeking a compromise path.

Our Congress has split into two implacable wings over the question of economic reforms. But I believe that it should emerge from this confrontation. I see a compromise in the idea that our government should realize that it is implementing the reforms with some mistakes and in a far from ideal manner. I agree that it is difficult to implement them, especially as this is aggravated by the extremely high level of politicization of society. But after all the majority at the Congress supports the government. It is merely a case of introducing experienced practical experts into the government.

One cannot fail to note also that it is now impossible for the deputies to assess the state of affairs objectively. The government is frightening them with expenses running into trillions of rubles, the Supreme Soviet says there will be nothing of the kind. Whom to believe? Very serious problems cannot be discussed in that way.

That is why it would be a sensible step to create a conciliation commission which would carry out all calculations and submit them: Here is the minimum for fulfilling the Congress decisions, here is the maximum. It should do this for every point. It should explain to everyone that there is no need to panic, a minimum is being done, social protection is being ensured. But so far there is no maximum potential. The deputies and the population will understand that.

Now that the government is stating categorically that it is right and parliament is doing the same, nothing good will come of it. Extreme positions have never yet produced balanced decisions.

I am sure that at the Congress there should be no winners and no losers. Let commonsense be victorious.

17 April

Newspaper Publishes Khasbulatov Report

PM2104151592 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 Apr 92 pp 1, 2

[Report by R.I. Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, to the Sixth Congress of Russian People's Deputies in Moscow's Grand Kremlin Palace 17 April: "R.I. Khasbulatov's Report"]

[Text] Esteemed President, Esteemed Chairman, Esteemed People's Deputies.

1. By a decision of the constitutional commission and of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, the amended [dorabotannyy] draft constitution of the Russian Federation is submitted for examination to the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies.

This draft is the result of prolonged joint work by the Constitutional Commission and the Supreme Soviet, by its committees and commissions, and by literally hundreds of specialists from our republics, oblasts, krays, and other regions—a multitude of experts. Various views were encountered. In most cases, mutually acceptable solutions were found. But the quest for rational compromise did not always enable us to preserve the common design. In our view, the draft is now close to a more or less optimum model reflecting the interests of all sections of our society, of our single federal state.

2. The problem surrounding the draft of the Russian Federation's new constitution has become more acute recently. At times projects, terms, and discussions appear which mislead the people. I will not speak of other approaches and projects for constitutional reform. I will dwell only on our approach—the Constitutional Commission's approach. The main idea is to ensure that there is an "effective president and an effective parliament." From our viewpoint, this concept has proved most valuable in the history of modern states.

A balance between the supreme legislative and executive bodies is ensured in the following way: The highest officials are appointed by the president with the consent of parliament. The president does not have the right to dissolve parliament, and in principle parliament cannot dismiss the president or the government as a whole. But if parliament demands it, the president can dismiss one or another minister, or parliament can do so at its own discretion and on its own authority. Of course, though the government acts under presidential guidance, it also has its own head, the prime minister, who is responsible

to parliament. But here it is necessary to keep constantly in mind the imperative postulate that any shaking of the institution of the presidency leads to a weakening both of parliament and of representative democracy generally; likewise, any attempt to belittle the role of parliament weakens the institution of the presidency and in principle the authority of the state. This, esteemed deputies, is something we must all understand.

3. Allow me to express a few considerations about a presidential parliamentary—or rather parliamentarian—republic. These terms have been brought into active use, but with little idea of what is at issue. Essentially, there is no future in any dispute about a presidential or parliamentary republic. A republic must first of all be democratic, whether it is presidential or parliamentarian. This is a secondary question—especially from the position of the country's citizens.

But in academic disputes the essence of all these differences lies mainly in the relationship between the president, the parliament, and the government. The question is one not of subordination, as is sometimes primitively and simplistically argued, but of constitutional norms enshrining the democratic nature of power.

Parliamentarian Republic

In the classic parliamentarian form of rule, the government is usually formed by parties which have a majority, sometimes even a minority, in parliament. The government is politically answerable to the parliament. This answerability concerns policy, and it applies even if the government does not violate a single law, but is simply doing its work inefficiently. This answerability is expressed in various legal forms. The strongest form is a vote of no-confidence by parliament or a refusal by parliament to express confidence in the government should it seek a vote of confidence itself. If this happens, there are two options—either the government resigns, or it asks the president to dismiss the government and schedule new elections.

The president of such a republic is only a nominal head of state who "reigns, but does not rule." Formally he can have considerable powers. However, he can only exercise these powers on the instructions of the head of government or the relevant minister, without whose official stamp no act of the president can take effect. The president is elected either by parliament or by an expanded collegium which includes members of parliament.

For instance, in Italy the collegium is made up of members of parliament plus representatives from the legislative assembly of the regions.

A parliamentarian system functions in a stable fashion where a majority in parliament is traditionally held by one party or by a stable bloc of parties which are close in their views or aims. In these conditions, votes of no-confidence hardly ever happen. The head of government, that is to say the prime minister or the federal chancellor, etc., has effective control of the general situation in parliament through a party faction or bloc of factions. Although here too there are exceptions.

If parliament is fragmented into numerous factions which are at loggerheads, the country is subjected to frequent government crises. Of course, in a calm economic environment where the competitive, market economy calls the shots and creates a stable, socioeconomic situation, this is nothing to be afraid of. For example, the fiery Italians are fairly indifferent to the political passions that rage constantly.

Presidential Republic

In a presidential republic the president is simultaneously both head of state and head of the executive. Like the parliament, he is elected by the people and therefore carries no direct political responsibility to parliament unless there is a specific law stating otherwise.

Formally, the president and his cabinet appear not to need the confidence of parliament, but that is only superficially so. First, the president cannot dissolve parliament. Their relationship is built on a system of checks and balances. Second, the president needs the support of parliament in the matter of the budget—the central issue of any state power.

The advantage of a presidential republic is that, regardless of which parties hold executive or legislative sway, both branches of power are obliged to cooperate, and this gives the regime special stability. For example, in the United States at present, as you know, the president is a Republican, but both houses of Congress have a Democrat majority, yet all's well and the work continues. Why? Because there is constant cooperation, constant interaction, constant compromise. About 70-80 percent of the U.S. President's working hours are spent on cooperation with congressmen and their leaders.

Mixed Forms of Republic

In a so-called mixed republic, the president is elected by the people, but in practice does not exercise his considerable powers. He keeps them in reserve, as it were, and the system functions mainly along parliamentary lines. Examples of countries with this system are Austria, Ireland, Iceland, Portugal, Finland, and recently Poland and Bulgaria.

France is called a semi-presidential republic.

The French model offers no insurance against constitutional crises if the party affiliations of the president and prime minister are substantially different. This happened for the first time, by the way, after the 1986 elections. Another example was in 1988, when President Mitterrand dissolved the National Assembly and then, after the elections, formed a government of Socialists, of whom the president himself was one before he was

elected. If that had been constitutionally impossible, the president would clearly have had to resign before the end of his term of office.

This provides a certain amount of historical experience, and the terminology which is in use. True, there is another crucial factor: Legislators never set themselves the task of creating a presidential, parliamentarian, mixed, or other form of state. This is most likely a matter of purely academic reflection and study that begins as a rule decades or even centuries after a state has emerged with a specific form of government and an appropriate political regime.

What was the conclusion reached by our Constitutional Commission?

Almost two years of tremendous work (on the part of hundreds of people, or rather 2,000-3,000) on the draft of the Russian Constitution enables us to state that the draft really provides for a system of checks and balances in the mechanism of power. No branch of the power structure will be able to encroach upon others or bring them under its jurisdiction, but will be obliged to act in conditions of reciprocal control, interaction, and mutual cooperation.

a) The draft of the Constitutional Commission takes account of the fact that our multiparty system is in an early state of development. So it is unlikely that a substantial multiparty system will emerge in the next few years. This question is by no means a simple one for our society. Regrettably, I do not think a classical parliamentary form of government can be seen as a practical reality in our country in the very near future.

One must not forget such a highly important factor in practical politics as a suitable political system, based in many respects on tradition, conventional law, ethical and judicial norms, and the style of the head of government or state (incidentally, the greatest misunderstandings now arise in our country on matters pertaining to the political system taking shape, which is seen as by no means in keeping with our previous statements regarding the development of a democratic state).

b) At the same time we must not absolutize the executive. The experience of the prerevolutionary reforms in Russia showed that sovereignty for officials created an extremely shaky, unstable, and changeable foundation for the whole edifice of reform. For instance, despite the establishment of a constitutional monarchy at the beginning of this century, our country preserved the former system of unlimited powers for the top administrative authority and its local bodies, which had operated since 1882.

c) Hence we can hardly be satisfied with the model of exclusive absolute power vested in representative bodies based on the idea "All Power to the Soviets," as it was proclaimed at one time.

d) This is why a form of state power and government has been chosen with a view to ensuring, first, the stable development of our multiethnic society, second, as a unified, integrated, and indivisible federal state in the form of a republic. In theory, if you like, this is a type of a parliamentarian-presidential republic. It takes into account our real situation, the sociopsychological and ethnic orientations of large groups of the population. It further takes into account the need for unconditional progress by the individual, society, and the state and facilitates the decentralization of power. What is more, to a considerable degree this power is devolved to the regions, in other words, decentralization becomes part of the constitution—this is democracy in the original sense of the word, whereby provincial power is linked to the rights of the individual, to guarantees of these rights ensured by the whole system of federal norms of law and the relevant institutions.

What distinguishes this from a classical presidential republic (the United States, for instance) is the fact that parliament, in line with established procedure, can dismiss members of the government, pass a vote of no-confidence in the government, and so forth. This conscious choice is explained by the peculiarities both of our Russian past and of the present Federation, which is diverse and unique in its makeup, in its provinces.

The Course of Work on the Draft Constitution

As you know, the First Congress of People's Deputies in June 1990 instructed the Constitutional Commission, which it elected, to prepare a new draft constitution for the Federation and present it for consideration at the next Congress of Russian People's Deputies. At its working and plenary sessions the Constitutional Commission prepared the draft and adopted it as a working basis, then as a basis, continuing to work on it. By decision of the commission, the draft was published three times—in November 1990, in October 1991, and in March 1992.

By a decision of the Constitutional Commission, the draft was put forward for consideration at the Fifth Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies in October 1991. The draft was presented to the Congress by Russian President Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Constitutional Commission. By its resolution of 2 November 1991, the Congress instructed the Constitutional Commission and the Supreme Soviet, "taking into consideration remarks and proposals by people's deputies...to amend the draft Constitution of the Russian Federation presented to the Congress and to submit it for consideration at the next Congress of People's Deputies." I must point out that between the Fifth and Sixth Congresses of People's Deputies the work of the Constitutional Commission was particularly active and fruitful.

During the preparations for the Sixth Congress, the amended draft, some provisions of which had been considerably reworked, was submitted 2 March 1992 for consideration by the chambers' standing commissions

and committees and also by deputies' groups (factions) from the Federation's Supreme Soviet, and then it was considered and discussed at a session of the Supreme Soviet.

Joint sessions of the chambers adopted as a basis Sections I, IV, V, and VI, as well as the section entitled "Transitional Provisions." In addition, the Soviet of the Republic adopted as a basis Sections II and III of the draft. The chamber of nationalities did not do this merely due to lack of time.

The Constitutional Commission, its working group and group of experts generalized and took account of the incoming amendments, and also the proposals by very many leading specialists in constitutional law, scientific establishments, Russia's Constitutional Court, Supreme Court, Prosecutor's Office, Foreign Ministry, and other establishments. It also considered letters from our fellow citizens.

All told, during the final phase, about 1,500 amendments were received, including 660 by way of legislative initiative. After careful consideration, 310 of them were taken into consideration.

We have assigned a special role to the provisions of the Federation Treaty. President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin spoke of its importance, and I will not repeat what he said here. I would just like to emphasize that its basic content has already been included in the text of the existing constitution and in the new draft constitution. As to what has not yet been accomplished, we have an opportunity to discuss calmly and sensibly the issues that have arisen and resolve them for the sake of the common good as we finalize the draft basic law.

On the Substance of the Main Sections of the Draft

1. Foundations of the Constitutional System

The concept for the new constitutional system is based on the great humanist ideas that proceed from the unshakable and inalienable nature of the rights and liberties of the individual and the citizen. The citizen is not placed under the yoke of an all-powerful state. The state is defined as society's official representative, authorized to settle the relations assigned to it by the constitution.

The draft constitution envisages a balance of rights with mutual checks and balances, which gives the state system stability and rules out any possibility of a monopoly of power. This is, of course, all theoretical: The political system for the head of government or state are of tremendous importance. We have already spoken of this.

We are faced with the very important task of not only approving the draft basic law of the Russian Federation, but also of inculcating the very spirit of constitutionalism, including respect for the law in the daily lives of Russia's inhabitants. This means combining the stability of the state's institutions with subordination to the sovereignty of the individual and the people as a whole, and respect for the repositories of statehood—we have obvious problems in this regard.

The draft proposes a clear and integral system of principles for a democratic constitutional system: These are power by the people as the basis of the state, federalism, state sovereignty, rights and freedoms of the citizen as the supreme value, primacy of the law, political pluralism, separation of powers, diversity of forms of economic activity, and a full-fledged role for the Russian Federation in the world community.

The structure of the draft follows a fairly clear and logical plan, and is based on the organic link between the individual, the civil society, and the state. In line with this, the draft includes the following sections:

1. The foundations of the constitutional system of the Russian Federation.
2. Basic rights, freedoms, and obligations of the individual and citizen.
3. Civil society.
4. The federative system.
5. The system of state power—the foundations of local self-government.
6. Final provisions.
7. Transitional provisions.

2. Rights and Freedoms of the Individual and the Citizen

The draft is based on the premise that the basic rights and freedoms of the individual belong to him from birth, that they are a supreme value and cannot be violated by the state or withdrawn except by decision of a court. It is the main obligation of the state authorities to ensure that human rights and freedoms are observed. The provisions in the section on human rights have been brought fully into line with international human rights pacts.

The content of Section II has been incorporated in the Supreme Soviet's declaration of rights and freedoms of the individual and the citizen. Like international pacts, the draft proceeds on the premise that the state authorities are obliged to observe and guarantee in equal measure all human rights and freedoms, be they civil, political, economic, social, or cultural.

The list of constitutional rights and freedoms has been considerably widened, many of them being enshrined for the first time.

Of particular significance are **guarantees** of equality of rights and freedoms. Legal guarantees of the implementation of rights and freedoms are particularly singled out: presumption of innocence; judicial protection of violated rights; judicial rulings as the only basis for restricting freedoms; and exemption from the obligation to testify against oneself, one's spouse, close relatives, etc.

Civil Society

A distinct feature of the draft is a special section entitled "Civil Society."

As the history and theory of states show, civil society encompasses the whole range of moral, legal, economic, and political relations, as well as institutions (property, work, and entrepreneurial activities), the organization and activity of public associations, upbringing, education, science, and culture, the family—which is the primary foundation of human society—the mass media, the unwritten ethical norms of human behavior, and a specific political regime.

It is precisely in the framework of civil society that most human rights and freedoms are embodied. That is why the relations and institutions of civil society enjoy the support and protection of the law in modern states. This is certainly not a tribute to any philosophy or ideology. In this sense it is hard to refer to the "decline of ideology" as if it were part of philosophy. Likewise it is difficult to claim that a civil society has emerged in our country. The formation of democracy and a civil society are parallel processes, ones which are exceptionally interdependent, complex, and fragile.

Constitutional enshrinement of the foundations for the free self- development of the institutions of civil society is imperative in view of the traditional underdevelopment of these institutions. This will create a reliable barrier to excessive interference by the state in the personal affairs of citizens, and guarantee the development of democratic principles for self-government in the main spheres of society's activity. At the same time, it is also clear that the state is not entitled to withdraw from the regulation of sociopolitical relations and the organization of economic and social relations.

Therefore, the section defines the state's obligations to a civil society.

4. The Federative System

The contents of the three federation treaties of 31 March 1992, approved by the present Congress, lie at the heart of Section IV in the draft constitution. Harmonization of the entire complex system of relations between the Russian Federation as a whole and its component parts is achieved by a clear definition of those areas which are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Russian Federation, as well as those areas which are within the joint jurisdiction of the Russian Federation and of the republics, krays, oblasts, autonomous oblasts, and okrugs. All other state powers are independently exercised by republics, krays, oblasts, and autonomous component parts.

The strength of the federation lies in its full-fledged component parts. The draft not only enshrines that aspect of federalism, but also obliges the federal authorities to give real content to the degree of socioeconomic autonomy for subjects of the Federation enshrined in the Federation Treaty. All component parts of the Federation have the right to conclude agreements among themselves and with the Federation, which gives them scope to flexibly exercise their powers and opportunities, which will henceforth be wide-ranging.

At the same time, the draft proceeds on the indisputable premise—and I want to underline this once again—that the Federation is an independent and integral state which may not be dismembered, and which, incidentally, has already been constituted politically and legally: It is an existing reality and does not need to be either recreated or to be formed anew.

One highly important result of the work on this section of the constitution is that conditions have been created for averting chaos and a war of constitutions and laws.

This delimitation of powers, not just vertically but horizontally (between the republics, oblasts, krays, and autonomous formations) will make it possible to achieve national harmony on issues of intrastate relations and ensure their stability—but this will apply only if these points are enshrined most speedily in a new constitution.

5. State Power

One of the main principles of the draft constitution is affirmation of the rule of law. In a constitutional state, power is subordinated to the law, and not the law to power. The law must operate and be effective, regardless of whatever political tendencies may be dominant in the country, in parliament, and in the government, regardless of the leader, of his image, and so on. This requirement has been clearly reflected in the draft constitution, and is guaranteed by the whole approach to the organization of state power, which combines the principles of federalism, strict separation of powers, and their mutual balancing.

Separation of powers means not only that power is decentralized [rassredotocheniye], distributed, and demonopolized, but that there are also real mutual balances to ensure that none of the three powers can infringe upon or subjugate the others, and that each will be forced to act with mutual checks and mutual cooperation. This does not only apply at the highest level of state power, but also throughout its hierarchy. It is for this reason that the combination of, first, an effective federal parliament, second, an effective president as the supreme official and head of state elected by the people's ballot, and, third, an effective and independent judiciary is proposed.

In view of the present destabilization and state of crisis, it is important that we create a firm, capable executive in order to carry out the enormous amount of work that needs to be done—to overcome this crisis, implement fundamental reforms, improve the people's living conditions, and raise our country to the level of developed countries. However this is not a question of short-term tasks. The constitution must undoubtedly serve as a potent force, exerting a powerful stabilizing influence on

society. In this respect, the constitution must not be oriented only toward immediate tasks. These undoubtedly important, but current, tasks must be, as it were, "fitted into" constitutional clauses that orient the country for decades, and maybe centuries into the future.

What is important here? The Federation's Supreme Soviet is formed through direct general elections. All citizens of the Russian Federation and all subjects of the Federation are represented in it. To this end the deputies of one of the chambers are elected so that each represents an equal number of the electorate, while the deputies of the second chamber will be elected in accordance with quotas that provide equal representation for the subjects of the Federation, regardless of the size of their population. Of course, there may be clarifications and additions here.

Further, the Supreme Soviet, which has the sole right to adopt and change laws, rules [opredelyat] on the basis of the constitution and the framework in which the legislative, executive, and judiciary operate. Parliament's strongest means of influence on the executive authority lies in its power to approve the budget and monitor [kontrol] its implementation, participate in the appointment of the head of government and, when necessary, to remove individual members of the government (that is, it is a question of powers of control, including absolute budgetary control, and also of parliamentary investigations, hearings, etc.); and monitor the activities of the special services and foreign intelligence service.

The Supreme Soviet is a working, politically stable permanent organ. After elections it convenes at a precisely defined date, it cannot be dissolved, it has the capacity to overturn the president's veto on laws it has adopted.

The Supreme Soviet is vested with the necessary legal means to stop anticonstitutional and illegal actions. The procedure laid down in the draft for dismissing federal officials should they break the law serves this purpose.

The draft constitution envisages that the chambers of the Federation's Supreme Soviet will work separately under the leadership of their chairmen. In certain cases joint sessions will be held, which the chairmen of the chambers will take turns to chair. This increase in the chambers' autonomy presupposes the abandonment of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, as otherwise it would stand above them, inevitably lessening their independence; there are no examples of bicameral parliaments in democratic states whose structure or procedures permit the formation of a body such as the Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The president exercises overall leadership of a government which he appoints with the agreement of the Supreme Soviet and which is simultaneously under scrutiny from parliament. The draft pursues the idea of a unified system of executive authority, with a president and government of the whole Russian Federation, governments of the republics, administrations of krays, oblasts, and autonomous oblasts and okrugs, and local administration, all acting in an interconnected fashion strictly within the limits of their authority.

A balance in the supreme bodies of legislative and executive authority is ensured in the following way. The president does not have the right to dissolve parliament; and parliament cannot dismiss the government as a whole.

The Constitutional Commission proceeds from the premise that to give the president and government less power than is proposed in the present draft would risk upsetting the balance of authority and could become a constant source of constitutional crisis and hamper the effective functioning of all the state authorities—legislative, executive, and judicial.

The draft constitution stipulates that the considerable increase in judicial power above all takes the form of extending judicial protection for all the rights and freedoms of the individual and citizen from possible violations by anyone. The draft makes the judicial authorities the custodians of civil peace, making it incumbent on them to ensure legality and justice.

The autonomy and independence of judges is guaranteed by a special procedure for their appointment and irremovability from office. A court of jurors, which has proved itself in the civilized world as a form enabling the people to participate in dispensing justice, will replace the court of people's lay assessors. Provision is also made for the reinstitution of justices of the peace, elected by inhabitants of rayons and towns, to examine administrative infringements and minor civil and criminal cases.

The Constitutional Court of the Federation is charged with guarding constitutional legality and is invested with broad powers of supervision over the constitutionality of the activities of the legislative and executive. That represents further real embodiment of the system of checks and balances laid down in the draft constitution. The Federation's Supreme Court heads the system of common courts and the Supreme Economic Court will head the system of courts which deal with economic disputes. We have abandoned the term "court of arbitration": Traditionally in our country, the state body for resolving economic disputes is usually called the arbitration service [arbitrazh], while the official resolving these disputes is called an arbitrator [arbitr], whereas worldwide arbitration [arbitrazh] generally means an arbitration tribunal [treteyskiy sud] conducted by arbitrators who are appointed by the parties to the dispute.

The prosecutor's office, relieved of the functions of supervision over everyone and everything, which are alien to it in a rule-of-law state, will become, in the main, a criminal prosecution organ, backing up the prosecution in court. The investigation of criminal cases is to be removed from the jurisdiction of the bodies of security, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the Prosecutor's Office and is concentrated in a special state body—the Investigation Committee.

Transitional Provisions

A special section has been included in the text of the draft constitution entitled "Transitional Provisions." It is precisely that section which regulates the process of the transition from the present situation to that for which the main sections of the Constitution make provision.

That is the most complex question from today's point of view. What is the crux of this issue?

First, the Congress' place during the transition period. This is not because the deputies are anxious about their own future, as is often said and written. All the six congresses have shown that the Congress brings considerable stability to society, and serves as a guarantor against the extremes that threaten society from various political forces (including the ruling forces).

Second, in this sense, there were two points of view in the Constitutional Commission and the Supreme Soviet. First, there was the view that the transitional provisions be included in the main text, as presented in the draft constitution. The second point of view is that the transitional provisions should be made part of a separate Congress law that would envisage as a whole the question of introducing the constitution, including its individual parts. For example, it is obviously logical to preserve everything relating to the president until the expiry of the incumbent president's term of office in line with the Law on the President.

This question could be discussed thoroughly once the proposed draft has been approved on the whole. During the adoption of the Constitution at the next Congress, for instance, or in some other way suggested by the Congress.

Conclusion

1. The work of formulating the draft of a new constitution has taken nearly two years, and this work **has already borne real fruit.** The draft constitution is not only a mere proposal today. The constitutional reform outlined in it is already being implemented.

Thus Section II of the draft formed the basis of the Declaration on the Rights and Liberties of the Individual and the Citizen, which was adopted by the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet.

The signing of the Federation Treaty was the natural conclusion of the process of drawing up and coordinating Section IV of the draft constitution, which has now been brought into line with the provisions of the recently signed treaties.

Changes have been made to Russia's existing constitution introducing the institutions of the presidency and the Constitutional Court. A number of alterations have been made to the articles on ownership, which was also originally envisaged in the draft constitution.

Adoption of a constitution is a key element in constitutional reform.

Many provisions in the proposed draft have been used in drawing up draft constitutions in friendly (CIS) states and also in a number of countries in Eastern Europe.

Life by and large confirms the correctness of the concept and normative material proposed by the Constitutional Commission.

2. Here is another element: The draft constitution cannot in principle be "arranged" to suit any single existing politician. Otherwise it would not be a constitution. We need to be absolutely clear about this. Everything concerning existing politicians, bodies of constitutional power, and various structures must find a place in the transitional provisions.

3. The difficult time spent seeking agreement on the constitutional reform has shown quite clearly that, with goodwill, there are virtually no problems on which the longed-for consensus cannot be reached between various approaches and interests.

We hope that this Sixth Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies will reach the necessary agreement on the proposed new draft constitution, which is so urgently required by Russia's multiethnic people and by our state itself, which also, incidentally, needs to be protected.

4. What the Congress might decide.

The Constitutional Commission considers it advisable to exchange views on the fundamental provisions of the new constitution.

It is very much to be hoped that deputies will approve the draft constitution. This will make it possible to accept it as the basis for further work. This is also important politically: First, because it would close a kind of constitutional gap which has formed due to Congress' vague attitude toward the draft of its own Constitutional Commission; second, it would show everyone yet again that our Congress is effective and viable, and that it really expresses the voice of the people and their interests; third, it would set the seal in the eyes of public opinion on our desire to proceed along the path of real democratic transformations.

Thank you for your attention.

Communists Introduce Draft Constitution

PM2104140192 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 17 Apr 92 p 1

[Report by special correspondent Pavel Anokhin: "News Conference: Once More Boldly Into Battle?"]

[Text] Another draft constitution was presented 15 April at the Sixth Congress of Russian People's Deputies Press Center. This time the action group of the Russian Communist Workers Party [RCWP] in the person of

Russian people's deputies Professor Igor Bratishchev, Yuriy Slobodkin, and Professor Mikhail Popov, member of the RCWP Central Committee, brought a "legal baby" into the world.

As befits Communist documents, it expresses awareness of the RCWP's historic responsibility for the 1,000-year history of the Russian state and proclaims devotion to the ideals of Freedom, Equality, Fraternity, and Justice, and also to the Red Banner of the 1917 revolution.

It goes without saying that in the Communist draft power belongs to the people, soviets of collectives, workers, peasants, specialists, and employees form the basis of state power; the church is separate from the state and the state from the church; while censorship of the mass media is not allowed.

Social ownership of the means of production in the form of soviet social and collective property forms the economic foundation of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] (the draft upholds that name for the state). "Personal ownership by individual citizens or groups of individual citizens" is also permitted (I wonder, on the basis of the 70-year history of the Communist regime, does "group of individual citizens" once again mean the RCWP nomenklatura alone?).

According to the proposed draft, "the state promotes the assertion of the principle of equal pay for equal labor" and, needless to say, rules out unemployment. The territory of the RSFSR is unified and is part of a Union of equal Soviet Socialist Republics.

"No one must implement laws in circumvention of the Constitution," Yuriy Slobodkin proclaimed the main principle of the draft.

"How does the draft ensure that the RCWP will not once again usurp power and render constitutional rights a sham?" ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA's correspondent asked.

"The multiparty system and the soviets of collectives ensure this..." came the reply.

In short they are once more boldly entering the battle for the power of the soviets!

18 April

Congress Proceedings for 18 Apr Reported

LD1804085592

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 0600 GMT on 18 April begins to carry live coverage of the proceedings of the Russian Federation's Sixth Congress of People's Deputies from the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow.

At 0600 GMT Radio Rossii announcer Vladimir Kornyukov goes over to the Congress of People's Deputies, where members are in the process of taking their seats. The deputies are to discuss the new draft Constitution and amendments to the old one, the announcer says. Deputies are already waiting by the microphones for a chance to speak, although the members of the Presidium have not yet taken their seats, he says.

At 0603 Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairman Vladimir Shumeyko, who is in the chair for this morning's session, invites deputies to register. Shumeyko announces that there is a quorum and gives the names of three deputies celebrating their birthdays today.

At 0605 a deputy comments on the agenda, asking why there has been no discussion on the social and economic situation in the north. He also suggests debate on social services and the Crimea.

At 0608 Shumeyko invites deputies to vote to adopt today's agenda as a basis. It is approved.

Deputy Gorelov then objects to the view that urban deputies have no right to take part in debates on rural issues, noting that food supplies affect the urban deputies too. Deputy Nazarchuk comments on the Radical Democrats' proposed land ownership referendum, saying that the agrarian deputies reflect the views of those with whom they work. He complains about the persecution of SELSKAYA ZHIZN, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, and PRAVDA.

At 0613 Deputy Smolin comments on land ownership. Deputy Utkin then raises the issue of social security, and Deputy Laptev states his support for a debate on the Crimea. Deputy Klyuyev then complains that the same people always get called to speak at the Congress.

At 0617 Shumeyko takes a vote on ending the debate on today's agenda; it is approved. Shumeyko comments on proposals for the agenda, suggesting that a debate on the north be left until 20 April; this proposal is accepted without a vote. A deputy interrupts to raise the question of a minimum wage. Shumeyko asks to defer the issue so the Congress can concentrate on the Constitution. Deputies insist on a vote on whether to debate a resolution on the social sphere; it is rejected.

At 0622 Shumeyko comments on the proposals to debate a referendum on land ownership. A deputy interrupts with his view on the issue, and Shumeyko says the issue would take up two days. Deputy Volkov points out that the issue is not whether to debate a land ownership referendum but rather the wording of the referendum. Shumeyko takes a vote on whether to put the issue of a land ownership referendum on the agenda; it is rejected. Deputy Varov then comments on the voting procedures on the land ownership issue.

At 0628 Shumeyko asks Laptev to withdraw his proposal to debate the Crimea; Laptev agrees to do so. Shumeyko asks about Klyuyev's complaint that people who have not yet spoken never get a chance. He takes a vote on whether those who have not yet spoken should speak first today; it is rejected. A deputy then makes a series of

procedural points, asking for a chance to question those who agreed on the Belovezhskaya Pushcha documents to set up the CIS.

At 0634 Shumeyko takes a vote on whether to adopt the agenda as a whole; it is approved. Several deputies then make procedural points. One asks why Yeltsin is absent. Is he ill, or what?, the deputy asks. At 0638 Sergey Shakhray, Yeltsin's representative, says there is no need to worry about Yeltsin's health and points out that there is no constitutional requirement for him to attend every day.

Deputies continue to make procedural points. At 0644 the deputies approve Shumeyko's request to begin debating the first point on the agenda, the draft Constitution. They also agree to limit each speaker to five minutes.

At 0647 Shumeyko offers the floor to the first speaker in the constitutional debate, Deputy Tsann-Kay-Si of the Free Russia group, who warns about the dangers of not approving the draft Constitution presented yesterday by Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov.

At 0653 Deputy Vladimir Medvedev of the Non-Party Deputies complains about provisions in the current Constitution which discriminate against individuals who do not belong to parties or other organizations and calls for the exclusion of such elements from the new draft. At 0700 Deputy Vladimir Varov of the Radical Democrats faction, a member of the Legislative Committee, speaks about the benefits of private ownership of land. Paragraph 7, he says, should be removed as its excludes private ownership.

At 0704 Deputy Viktor Sheynis of the Constitution Committee notes that the adoption of a new Constitution would act as an element of stabilization. He favors the adoption of this Constitution.

At 0712 Deputy Galazov of North Ossetia recalls the fate of the Union and voices the hope that Russia will not suffer the same fate. The Federative Treaty should be reflected in the Constitution, he says. He reminds the Congress of the problems in South Ossetia and calls for aid to that region.

At 0718 Deputy Isakov of the Agrarian Union faction says the Constitution is being discussed in conditions of economic and social collapse as Russia, too, is on the point of collapse. It is the social conditions which define what happens in practice, not just the law. More work needs to be done with alternative drafts of the Constitution, Isakov says.

At 0724 Kokov, president of the Kabardo-Balkar Republic, calls for further work on a draft Constitution as the current one under discussion is not in accord with the interests of the member republics.

At 0733 Deputy (Zorkov) of the Communists of Russia faction criticizes the working group's draft and praises the virtues of that produced by his own faction. (Zorkov) claims that the official draft ignores the past and concentrates on only one section of society. He urges a referendum on the main points in the two drafts.

At 0740 Deputy Glotov of the Fatherland faction warns against discarding all the positive achievements of the past in the rush for economic reform. He describes Russia's federal structure as a fact and calls for the Federative Treaty to be included in the Constitution as a separate section. He urges that the draft be discussed by republican and regional parliaments before the next Congress.

At 0746 Deputy Muravyev of the Smena-New Policy faction urges wide-ranging constitutional reform and describes the amendments to the old Constitution as the first step in this process. He urges early publication of the current, amended Constitution and supports the adoption of the basic principles of the new draft. He rejects the notion of holding a referendum in today's polarized society and proposes the transformation of the Constitutional Commission into a Committee for Constitutional Reform.

At 0752 Deputy Sabirov, Tatarstan prime minister, praises his government's economic policies. He says the nature of the Russian Constitution is important for his republic. The 1936 Constitution, Sabirov says, did not give republics the right to secede; the new one should ensure that they do not want to do so. He denies that Tatarstan is seeking to undermine the integrity of the Russian Federation and complains about the distorted media coverage of developments in his Republic.

At 0800 Shumeyko announces a break until 0830 GMT and coverage ends.

At 0830 the Radio Rossii announcer notes that Vladimir Shumeyko is again chairing the session. As the deputies register Shumeyko notes that there is no quorum. The deputies register again and Shumeyko notes that there is now a quorum.

At 0835 Deputy Fedoseyev says his group supports the draft Constitution and that it should be adopted as a basis. None of the alternative drafts are acceptable, he says. The draft Constitution by the Constitutional Commission strengthens the unity of the country and equality among the nations inhabiting the country as well respecting the decisions of the Second Congress regarding land.

At 0841 Deputy Astafyev takes the floor and calls for deputies to respect the constitutional process itself. For instance, he says, all groups of deputies, not just the ruling one, should have access to television. In these difficult times the important thing is to keep the existing Constitution and follow it to the letter. Adopting any other constitution is futile now, because next year we will have to adopt a new one, he says.

At 0846 Rumyantsev takes the floor, saying that of course a new Constitution is needed as it contains the

foundations of a new political and judicial system. Rumyantsev notes that there is a high degree of consensus on the draft Constitution among deputies, but that the form of government and political regime still needs to be discussed. He hopes that the draft Constitution will be adopted today as a basis and that disagreements can be resolved.

At 0853 Bashkortostan Agriculture Minister Gabitov takes the floor to speak about the federal system and relations between Russia and the Republics. He points out that the draft does not reflect the federation treaties on ethnic republics with Russia and that the Federative Treaty is of primary importance and should be enshrined in the new Constitution. The current draft does not acknowledge the existence of republics within the Russian federation, he points out, and the Bashkir Supreme Soviet is not happy with the draft since it does not recognize Bashkortostan as an independent sovereign state. The Constitution, he argues, is proposing an administrative state which is effectively unitarian, not a federation. The current draft requires revision so that it recognizes republics within the Russian Federation as sovereign states, Gabitov concludes.

At 0859 Deputy Tarasov from Rostov takes the floor. He argues that the Constitution should reflect the basic commandments and that the interests of Russia are not protected in the draft. He says it is futile to adopt a new Constitution now because it will not be followed anyway; the country is in too deep a crisis.

At 0905 Tumov from the Sovereignty and Equality group takes the floor. He focuses on the need for ethnic groups to be represented in one of the chambers of the Supreme Soviet and notes that the new Constitution should reflect this.

At 0912 Shumeyko suggests that the debate be closed, but it is decided to give the floor to Sergey Shakhray.

At 0915 Shakhray opens his speech with a definition of the essential attributes of statehood. A Constitution is not a detailed document but a concise document enshrining human rights and freedoms, the main task of which is to create the checks and balances which can remove conflicts between nations. Stability of state power is essential, he says, and this is reflected in the draft Constitution proposed by his group. The official draft, Shakhray argues, fails to outline clearly the relationship between parliament and the president. The official draft would not remove the frequent government crises and soviets would have too much power.

At 0921 Deputy Bokov, a member of the commission for interethnic relations, takes the floor to speak about the imperfections in the current draft Constitution. This is the draft of the Westernizers, he says, simply a revised version of all other Western constitutions. This draft should not be adopted. The idea of a market economy should not be present in the new Constitution, as it gives total freedom to speculators and cheaters, Bokov notes. This draft Constitution should be revised and it should assimilate and include ideas from alternative drafts, he concludes.

At 0930 Khasbulatov takes the floor for a closing report. He praises the working group which developed the official draft Constitution and deplores the fact that so few deputies volunteered to take part in the demanding work of the group. He speaks about some deputies' unwillingness to work in the Constitutional Commission.

This draft constitution, he says, should be adopted as a base. Many are unhappy about it, but these small disagreements can be sorted out after the draft is adopted in rough outline, Khasbulatov points out. This is a good draft Constitution and it should be adopted; it maps out the fundamental strategy and fundamental principles for the life of the state. Khasbulatov goes on to state that he was disappointed with the speeches made by some ethnic deputies who were trying once again to stir up interethnic issues. In response to an earlier suggestion, he says that the proposed idea for treaty-based relations is inadequate.

At 0939 Khasbulatov proceeds to speak about certain ethical norms. He addresses Shakhray, saying that amendments will be taken into account in the Constitution and will not be ignored. It is necessary to resolve the crucial question of the draft Constitution. If it is not passed, Khasbulatov says, the deputies will be running the risk of damaging their own prestige. He concludes at 0943 by saying that further work can be carried out later.

At 0948 deputies continue making points on the draft resolution on the Constitution.

At 1001 Shumeyko outlines the three proposals before the Congress: to adopt the draft Constitution as a basis; to adopt the draft as a whole; or to adopt the general concept of constitutional reform and the basic provisions of the draft. He takes a vote, and the results are: first proposal—388; second proposal—330; third proposal—519.

At 1009 Shumeyko attempts to put the third option to a formal vote but is interrupted by deputies making procedural points. At 1012 another vote is taken. The vote is adopted with 664 in favor. Shumeyko announces a break but notes that members of the Supreme Soviet are to stay behind.

At 1014 GMT coverage ends.

At 1201 proceedings resume and government ministers have appeared for this session. A total of 776 deputies register.

At 1205, after some wrangling over procedures, the session chairman says the draft constitution of the Russian Federation and any further work that needs to be done on it is to be voted on point by point. The first point has already been passed, he says. The second point—on publication and discussion of the draft—is

debated. Deputy Golovin eventually suggests that the draft that is to be used as a basis should be voted on first; then the Smena draft and that of the Constitutional Commission should be examined and combined by the drafting commission. The deputies reject this suggestion.

At 1227 Shumeyko asks for a vote on Point 2 of the decision, whatever its final position in the document may eventually be. The deputies approve.

At 1232 the third point, stipulating that the Constitutional Commission is to complete the drafting, is voted on and rejected. The next proposal is for the Supreme Soviet and the Constitutional Commission to complete the drafting; this proposal is passed.

At 1241 Shumeyko goes back to a Yeltsin proposal, which Shakhray says is an addition to the first point. Shumeyko reads out the Yeltsin proposal: to adopt the draft as a basis in the version approved by the Supreme Soviet. The deputies vote on whether to go back to the first point and decide not to. Another Yeltsin proposal is read out by Shumeyko, this one asking that the president's proposals be considered in adopting the draft. This proposal is passed as Point 4. Deputy Golovin suggests an additional point but the deputies vote to reject it.

At 1250 Shumeyko suggests a point that the final draft of the Constitution by submitted to a future Congress; the deputies approve.

At 1257 a deputy insists on going back to the wording of the last point, but the deputies decide against returning back to it.

At 1304 the draft decision is voted on as a whole after Shumeyko reads it out; it is passed.

At 1307 a deputy suggests the Crimean issue be discussed now. The deputy is reminded by Shumeyko that Foreign Minister Kozyrev is ready to deliver his report on the CIS.

At 1310 Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev begins to speak on Russian's position in the CIS. He goes over the history of the collapse of the former Soviet Union and the founding of the CIS. It was a choice between the creation of a new political system around Russia, on the one hand, and the Yugoslav option, on the other, he says. Hecklers are heard as Kozyrev comments on the plight of ethnic Russians in the former republics. A difficult path had to be taken between avoiding conflict and taking tough measures to defend the interests of ethnic Russians, he says.

At 1315 Kozyrev denies that Baker was quicker off the mark in establishing links with the new CIS states than Russia, for whom CIS matters are an important foreign policy priority. Numerous documents and agreements have been signed, he says. Russia's standing in the world as the Soviet Union's successor derives from her policy of trust and cooperation, not her nuclear potential, and Russia plans to continue to treat the CIS states as equal partners, the foreign minister says.

At 1320 Kozyrev points out that the Russian Federation will not disintegrate as the USSR did. He notes that not everything is not going smoothly and certain CIS members are failing to sign some agreements. Russia wants maximum integration and cooperation and supports the democratic, economic, and social development of all the CIS states. Following the decision to create Russia's own army, relations with foreign countries will be carried out by politicians, not the military, he says. He calls for an urgent closed session of committees of the Supreme Soviet to discuss the situation in trouble spots. Kozyrev promises that Russia will promote the development of information and culture and will combat drug trafficking and organized crime.

At 1330 Kozyrev says that good relations with the Ukraine are a policy priority. He says:

"Esteemed People's Deputies, in the situation prevailing today one cannot fail to speak about the prospects for Russian-Ukrainian relations. It is quite clear that we consider the preservation of friendly and fraternal relations between our states and peoples as one of the priorities of Russian international policy."

Kozyrev continues:

"One cannot fail to speak about the problems which have arisen in connection with Ukraine's announcement of its new policy on economics and in a number of other spheres. Of course, if the course of disrupting existing economic links is taken, we will be obliged in the future to adopt commensurate measures to defend our economic interests. In particular, we will be obliged to raise the question of the strict observation by the Ukrainian side of civilized procedures for the withdrawal from the Ruble Zone, and so on.

"But we have always been in favor of resolving all problems with Ukraine by means of talks on the basis of universally recognized principles and norms of international law, CIS documents, and bilateral accords. The Russian side has put forward dozens of initiatives during this time to try to overcome tension in a number of spheres of relations with Ukraine. We have proposed setting up a permanent negotiating mechanism which would facilitate the construction of new Russian-Ukrainian relations.

"It is from these positions that we approach the settlement of all the still unresolved problems connected with the Black Sea Fleet. As a result of the work of the Russian and Ukrainian delegations, it has just been agreed that official talks on these questions will take place in Odessa on 22-25 April. The resolution on the Black Sea Fleet prepared jointly by the Foreign Ministry and a number of deputies—which, as I understand it, is now being circulated—could well be very timely."

The Russian foreign minister then moves on the issue of the Crimea.

"Esteemed people's deputies, as far as the Crimea is concerned, we proceed on the basis of the agreement signed in Minsk on 8 December 1991, on the formation of the CIS, which envisages mutual recognition and respect for the territorial integrity of states which are members of the CIS and the inviolability of existing frontiers within the Commonwealth framework. I would like to stress these words—within the Commonwealth framework. We also take into account here the fact that the abovementioned agreement was ratified by the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation and we hope that the congress will support that historic decision.

"Yes, we are all worried about the Crimea and sympathize with the people of the Crimea. We cannot fail to take into account the special links which exist between Russia and the Crimea, and Sevastopol. It would be irresponsible for any politician—be it in our country or in Ukraine—to forget that. We speak of that frequently and openly in conversations at all levels and we are continuing to raise that question to Ukrainian leadership. Here, responsibility is demanded on both sides, as well as special understanding from our partners.

"Esteemed people's deputies! The president, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, in connection with the formulation of the question about the Crimea, in the form in which it occurred yesterday and the day before yesterday, asked that the congress be informed of that, and he found that such a formulation, in that form, is untimely and potentially destabilizing. The fact of the matter is that the formulation of the question of the Crimea in such a form may give rise to a new upsurge of pseudo-patriotic forces in both Ukraine and in other republics and lead to the escalation of unfriendly moods and tension in interstate relations.

"I would like to draw your attention once again to the thought that the strengthening of nationalistic aggressive forces beyond the frontiers of Russia will be turned, first of all, against the Russian-speaking population in the relevant state. That will also have a negative affect on more specific directions in politics. We have only just managed to beat down confrontation around the Black Sea Fleet—on which I have just delivered a report to you. We are embarking upon talks—just as the presidents proposed. It is important not to complicate the course of the talks on the ratification of the strategic offensive arms treaty, on the fate of the army, and on the mechanism for withdrawing tactical nuclear weapons for destruction on the territory of Russia.

"Unfortunately, esteemed people's deputies, the CIS already has quite a lot of experience on exchanging outbursts and accusations."

At 1337 GMT, Kozyrev finishes speaking. Deputy Isakov asks whose idea it was to discuss the CIS without the president at the session and in a boring bureaucratic report as well. He calls for Yeltsin to appear before the congress on 20 April to discuss this matter. In answer to another deputy who wants Yeltsin to appear before the congress, Shumeyko says: "We'll decide that at the congress later." A vote is passed only in favor of continuing with the questions to Kozyrev.

At 1341 GMT, an unidentified deputy questions the legal basis of the CIS and asks on what basis does Kozyrev act as minister. Kozyrev says the documents are well known and that there is no alternative to the founding of the CIS.

At 1344 GMT, an unidentified deputy seeks clarification of what President Yeltsin wants in regard to the Crimea issue. Kozyrev answers that the president wants the issue to be dropped at the congress but the Supreme Soviet should be allowed to keep the issue in its purview.

At 1346 GMT, an unidentified deputy asks about ethnic Russians in the former republics and negotiations over Pskov oblast and Moldova. Kozyrev says that Russia does not accept any territorial claims in the Baltic or elsewhere.

At 1350 GMT, an unidentified deputy asks about the Dniester talks. Kozyrev says the second round of talks on the Moldova situation ended only this morning. Romania is involved in the talks because the matter of pro-Romanian feelings in Moldova has to be dealt with somehow, he says. Kozyrev continues saying that heroic poses are a waste of time in the present circumstances: three quarters of Moldovan Russians are not in the Dniester republic.

At 1356 GMT, an unidentified deputy asks what the congress should do now about the Black Sea Fleet. One of the drafts circulated at the congress could perform a positive function, Kozyrev says.

At 1358 GMT, the question and answer session with Kozyrev ends. Deputy Ispravnikov reads out a statement on missing journalist Plotnikova who was investigating corruption and demands that officials should be asked about this. This is followed by miscellaneous announcements of which one says the congress will be continued on Monday, 20 April.

At 1359 GMT, the evening session ends.

Khasbulatov Appeals to Deputies

LD1804140292 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0930 GMT 18 Apr 92

[Speech by Ruslan Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, at the session of the Sixth Congress of Russian People's Deputies in the Kremlin—live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed People's Deputies, esteemed Presidium. [passage omitted]

Pardon me for saying that I was very disappointed by the speeches made by the representatives of our esteemed republics. We just concluded the Federation Treaty last

February. And that was not the result of the pressure put on us by the republics. So, why are you trying now to oppose once again that fragile equilibrium that was regained by again stressing the interethnic factor. That is very unfair.

I am seriously exhorting all the deputies from the republics to vote today in favor of the draft constitution. Look, could we have concluded the Federation Treaty if pressure had been put on us? Could we have achieved it if the Supreme Soviet, the president, the government, and all our social forces, including the forces and the authorities in the actual republics, had not realized the necesssity of it. That is one thing.

Second, esteemed People's Deputies, I want to remind you that in history there was just one instance of a treaty-based republic. Oman was such a treaty-based republic. [passage omitted] There were no other instances of treaty-based republics or treaty-based federative republics, and there could not be, since under these conditions no state can be formed. The delimitation of powers between various federal, republican, oblast, and kray authorities has been clearly recorded in the system of federation treaties. And no one will benefit from trying to implement them or to interpret them in different terms. And one must not do this, nor must one even try to do this. For everyone then will be a looser, and the republics will be the first to lose. Is this clear?

Let us leave the terms of a treaty-based federation or a federation republic for academics to argue about—not to politicians whose task is to adopt political and state decisions in the framework of practical politics. [passage omitted]

If you fail to pass today this draft constitution, do you think we will be able to engage more actively and persistently in tackling major issues of the life of our state. No we will not be able. [shouting from assembly: Yes we will.] No, we will not be able... [assembly shouting again: Yes we will.] I say again: No, we will not be able. Why? Because our citizens will see that you and I have failed to adopt a necessary decision on a major issue raised by the Congress. This is true. And we will undermine our own prestige, I can assure you. That is what will happen. That is the first thing.

Therefore, concerning the first item I am asking for your support. The draft constitution must be adopted in rough outlines, or, I do not know, as a basis. That is the question of wording, no doubt. We could discuss all the suggestions proposed to us by the constitutional commission, and perhaps we could write down some sort of program for our further work on this draft constitution. That is up to the deputies' imagination, common sense, and generally their good will—something which could help to resolve the complex issues that some deputies link to the content of the constitution. Thank you.

Shumeyko Reads Constitutional Resolution

LD1804173292 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 18 Apr 92

["Text" of resolution on the draft Constitution read by Vladimir Shumeyko, chairman of the Congress of People's Deputies constitutional committee and deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow—live]

[Text] Let's vote on this as a whole, look how much of your time...I put the question to the vote. Who is in favor of adopting, as a whole, the draft resolution entitled "On the Draft Constitution of the Russian Federation and the Procedure for Further Work on It?" I ask you to vote. [shouts from the hall] Okay, I will read it out. Enough, I will read it out. I will read it, the people's deputies are requesting it, so I will read it out:

Having examined the draft constitution of the Russian Federation introduced by the constitutional commission and the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, after finishing work on it and in accordance with the resolution of the Fifth Congress of People's Deputies of 2 November 1991, the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation resolves:

First, to approve the general concept of constitutional reforms in the Russian Federation laid out on the basis of the draft constitution of the Russian Federation, and also the main clauses of the draft approved by the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet.

Second point. To publish the draft constitution for everyone's information.... [shouts in the hall, voice says "The Shakhray version"] Yes, the second point is from the president, this is how it reads:

Chapters of the draft constitution of the Russian Federation—sixteen, federal legislative authority, and seventeen, on the president of the Russian Federation and federal executive authority—are to have work completed on them, taking into account the proposals and observations of the president of the Russian Federation.

Third point. To publish the draft constitution of the Russian Federation for everyone's information—well, it was proposed to make this the penultimate one, I remember that, let it be the third. To publish the draft constitution of the Russian Federation for everyone's information and to organize in the republics within the Russian Federation, and in krays, oblasts, autonomous oblasts, autonomous districts and the towns of Moscow and St. Petersburg, a broad discussion of this document and to study public opinion on its principle clauses.

Third point, excuse me, the fourth point. To instruct the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation and the constitutional commission to conclude work on the draft constitution of the Russian Federation, taking into account the proposals and observations of the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation, the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, People's Deputies

of the Russian Federation and the Republics within the Russian Federation, and of krays, oblasts, autonomous oblasts, autonomous districts, and the towns of Moscow and St. Petersburg, and of citizens.

And finally the last point: The Supreme Soviet and the constitutional commission are to introduce the completed draft constitution of the Russian Federation at the regular Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation.

I ask you to vote as a whole. [a vote is then taken and Shumeyko announces: "It is adopted." No figures are given. Shumeyko then moves on to other business]

Further on Constitutional Debate

LD1804135592 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1324 GMT 18 Apr 92

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—The Congress of Russian People's Deputies today approved the general concept of constitutional reforms and the key provisions of the draft Constitution of the Russian Federation, which were approved by the Supreme Soviet.

Work on a resolution on the draft Constitution will continue at the Congress's evening session.

The approval of the draft, although with reservations, was achieved in impassioned debates. "We are not prepared to live under a new Constitution until we learn to respect the old law," believes Mikhail Astafyev, who spoke on behalf of a group of deputies representing the right-wing opposition.

Yevgeniy Tarasov, a deputy from Rostov-on-Don, aired a similar view. He emphasised that no fundamental law will be fulfilled in the present-day conditions when "comprehensive crisis" is plaguing the country.

"The transition period does not rule out the adoption of the Constitution," Sergey Shakhray argued in turn. However, he criticised some provisions of the draft prepared by the Constitutional Commission, saying that interaction between legislative and executive authorities is only declared in it.

It is bad when executive bodies have too much power but it is likewise bad when legislative bodies wield more power than necessary. Shakhray thinks that the necessary balance of power is ensured in the alternative draft fundamental law (in the lobby of the Congress it is called the Shakhray project).

Constitutional Commission Executive Secretary Oleg Rumyantsev called, on behalf of the commission, for adopting the official draft as a basis for further discussion. In summing up the debate, Ruslan Khasbulatov made the same proposal.

However, deputies decided that the wording "to adopt as a basis for further discussion" as too categorical and voted for a softer variant—"to approve the general concept".

Kozyrev Addresses Congress

LD1804194892 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 18 Apr 92

[Address by Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev at the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow—live]

[Text] Esteemed presidium! Esteemed congress! Esteemed people's deputies!

There is nothing to choose between the USSR and the CIS today. Essentially the CIS is the only possible form for the renewed union which you spoke out in favor of in the historic declaration on state sovereignty. The USSR was destroyed by lack of foresight, intolerance, and the inability to find flexible solutions responding to the demands of the time. This was stated by the presidents of the three republics who signed the original agreement establishing the CIS. Later, that same logic was affirmed in Alma- Ata by the leaders of practically all the remaining republics of the former union. Like everybody, we remember that catalysts of the disintegration of the USSR were violent actions—in Tbilisi, Baku, Vilnius, as well as in Moscow in August 1991.

The real choice which we can and should make is the choice between the difficult and multi-staged process of the formation of the CIS and further uncontrolled collapse, the exacerbation of relations with our neighbours, a choice between building, brick by brick, a zone of good-neighborliness around Russia, or a Yugoslav version, the hopeless and destructive use of force.

Let us look at whether there is a real alternative policy proceeding not only from what is wished but from what is possible, not so much out of plans and concepts, but out of pragmatism. I would like to dwell upon the problem of our compatriots which is of concern to all of us. It begins at home and depends upon how we feel in Russia, how we accept our neighbors. If we give in to the temptation of irritation and offense, an inferiority complex, we will obtain the Soviet Union, albeit in a reduced form, a fortress under seige, this time in confrontation not with U.S. imperialism, but with our brothers, our Slavonic brothers in Ukraine, our Muslim friends in Central Asia, and so on and so forth.

Those who in a fit of jingoism are now threatening their neighbors, while secretly harboring the hope of reinstating a Russian socialist camp, condemn their fellow countrymen in neighboring states [someone is shouting from the floor asking what Kozyrev is talking about] to being regarded as a hostile reactionary force. [shouting and mumbling continues; Shumeyko, chairman of the

session, interrupts and tells deputies to stop shouting from their seats as if they were in a bazaar]

Esteemed people's deputies, I am telling you about the real situation, using, among other things, the impressions I received on my recent trip to the CIS countries. Any thoughtless move on our part prompted by our heroic patriotism leads to trouble there, to outbursts of Russophobia. This was reported by representatives of the Russian and Russian-speaking population in all republics. If we ourselves want to build a democratic state and live there according to the highest standard, we must use the same highest standards in our relations with our neighbors in the CIS, without any excuses and attempts to justify ourselves by believing that we are not yet mature enough for democratic standards. This does not mean, however, that we must not use sufficiently tough methods, including those of force, for the defense of Russia's interests and human rights. On the contrary, what is meant is the development of these levers, but in strict accordance with the contemporary norms and concepts of international law. We are actively introducing the method of legal defense through diplomatic and consular measures. Thus, recently a Russian officer arrested in Lithuania was released thanks to the consular staff of the Russian Foreign Ministry. I am citing this incident as a small instance of a great deal of work that is being carried out and implemented in this direction. It is necessary to use not only diplomatic but also trade and economic levers in our relations with these states. There are of course flaws in the way governments coordinate their actions. Objective difficulties exist. In most republics which I recently visited I had to hear reproaches for disruptions in communication, and shortfalls in food supplies, with Russia, among others, to blame. This, of course, weakens our possibilities. But the enhancement of reforms in Russia will give an impetus to our relations with our closest neighbors and allow us to be firmer in our dealings with them.

Russia's policy arsenal also includes international mechanisms which the republics are going to be forced to consider not only out of political considerations, but also in the hope of receiving economic aid which the West traditionally ties to the observance of human rights and all CSCE standards. There is a view going around that we have got off to a late start in our relations with the CIS countries. It is frequently said, moreover, that Baker overtook us. But, esteemed people's deputies, you and I know that the highest proportion of the president's hours, so to speak, in foreign policy is spent on work with the CIS countries. Moreover, in line with the logic of attempts to recreate a renewed union in one shape or another, our priority is of course centered on multilateral institutions, not bilateral relations. The U.S. simply cannot get involved in that. In a relatively short time, more than 100 documents have been signed just at summit level. At Russia's initiative, we have seen the creation not just of the Council of Heads of State, the Council of Heads of Government, and the Inter- Parliamentary Assembly, but also the councils of economic and defense ministers, a council for railway transport, an Interstate Commission for Food Imports, and so on. I am not going to dwell on all these specific details. You can find them in all sorts of reference documents. At just the latest meeting of the Council of Heads of State in Kiev on 20 March, a package of agreements on military matters was adopted. They deal with the powers of the supreme Commonwealth bodies on defense matters, the principles of personnel acquisition, and the legal basis of the operation of the Joint Armed Forces, and so on. There were agreements on the status of the border troops and the guarding of the state border. Drafts of another 20 joint documents are to be presented at the next meeting of the Council of Heads of Government to be held in Chisinau on 24 April. Today the CIS is a self-evident economic reality. The majority of the CIS states have signed agreements and protocols creating the legal basis for economic management, regulating relations in the sphere of trade and economic cooperation in 1992, guaranteeing citizens' rights in the sphere of pension entitlements, and determining the mechanism for servicing the former union's internal debt [as heard], the principles of customs policy, tax policy, and the basic principles of cooperation in the scientific, technical, and other spheres.

Today, at last, the CIS is a reality in world politics. The sovereignty and independence of the CIS member states are widely recognized by the world community. They have all become members of the UN and the CSCE and have established diplomatic relations with the majority of states of the world.

Russia's place in the contemporary world is determined today not so much by its nuclear potential as by the fact that it is carrying out a policy of confidence-building and cooperation. Russia, as the successor to the USSR, has occupied a place as a permanent member of the UN Security Council and participates in 16,000 international treaties and agreements, around 600 of which are multilateral. As you appreciate, all of that demands great daily work to bring these agreements into line with the new requirements and realities. Key agreements among them are those aimed at the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, at limiting the arms race, the convention for protecting human rights and basic freedoms, as well as the rights and basic freedoms of national minorities. We maintain diplomatic relations with 160 countries. Moreover, we recognize the obvious advantages of an interested and well-balanced course for the development of priority relations with states which have been formed on the territory of the former union.

Russia intends in the future, too, to build its relations with its CIS partners as with equal participants in the international process. The Commonwealth is also an element of the global military and political system. Russia is recognized as the only nuclear power on the territory of the former USSR. The gradual withdrawal of nuclear arms onto its territory is under way. Military and strategic stability are being maintained on the whole.

And finally, the fact that Russia is affirmed in its integral statehood in the Commonwealth is a factor of the political reality. The claim that the formation of the CIS is a signal for the collapse of Russian statehood itself, for its total disintegration, is unfounded. Everything is in fact the other way round, and your vote in favor of the federation treaty confirmed that once again.

At the same time, I would not like to create the feeling that the establishment of the Commonwealth is proceeding painlessly and unequivocally in a positive light. A whole range of vital questions are being resolved in a very difficult manner. The difficulties in the military and political sphere are well known. Only now hope is arising that an interbank agreeement will be concluded. Not all the participants in the CIS are signing all the documents. Not all of them are participating in all coordinating mechanisms. However, esteemed people's deputies, are there any alternatives for further work and for overcoming these difficulties?

Nevertheless, let's speak about what is possible to be done. The Russian Government and Supreme Soviet are approaching this issue with a simple and clear formula. We, representatives of Russia, are always in favor of such a level—of a maximum level—of cooperation and integration, of concessions to be made in sovereignty in favor of joint actions which fully suit our partners. There has not been a single instance—and I believe there will not be any in the future—when one or another agreement was not reached and when Russia was to be blamed for this. But such is reality that we are forced to pay attention to the pace of actions our partners are undertaking.

What are the main priorities of Russia's policies in the CIS? They are determined by the national interests of the Russian Federation. Of course, the process of detailing them and formulating will continue. We hope here for calm and interested joint work with the Supreme Soviet. The priorities include the revival of Russia as a democratic and as a free country, ensuring suitable living standards for Russians, responsibility for maintaining the balance in global strategic stability, creating favorable external conditions for the strengthening of Russian statehood, the full and natural inclusion of the Russian Federation into the world community, ensuring the security of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Russian Federation, creating a dynamic market economy and democratic institutions, and protecting the rights of citizens—especially of compatriots. They also include transforming the space the Commonwealth occupies into a region of good-neighborliness and partnership, laying sound foundations of relations with the CIS countries which could become a material factor ensuring the security of Russia in all spheres: military-political, economic, humanitarian, ecological, scientific- technical, and legal. The priorities also include rendering assistance in taking all the CIS countries—all of them together—along a democratic path and helping them to resolve their economic, social, ethnic, and other problems.

In a word, we are in favor of such a close cooperation—I would like to repeat—to which our partners are ready. At the same time, there is no need for dramatizing the difficulties of the process of which we are very well informed. The West European community was not built in one day. Its construction is still not over. We should add bilateral relations to the mechanism of multilateral relations. We have already established diplomatic relations with virtually all the states which have been created on the territory of the former USSR. Work on the opening of embassies and consulates is under way. But, esteemed deputies, this is also connected with financial difficulties and with the selection of cadres for this non-traditional diplomatic work.

On the strategic plane, we intend to orientate ourselves not on the principle of a sea convoy, the movement of which is determined by the speed of the slowest boat, but toward the formation within the framework of the Commonwealth of a political and economic core which will be a locomotive of integration and reforms. The start of its formation was made on 23 March in Uralsk during a joint session of the governments of Russia and Kazakhstan. For the first time within the framework of the CIS, a complete agreement on the economic policy of reforms was achieved and concrete mechanisms to implement the agreements achieved were defined. Consultations are going on regarding a military-political union between the two states. In the near future, talks similiar to the Uralsk ones are planned with Byelarus and Kyrgyzstan. Our desire and the necessity of prolonging the creation of a Russian army for the maximum amount of time possible so as not to push others toward this have led to certain deficiencies in the sense of the ability of Russia as a state, and of its foreign policy bodies, to participate in resolving these issues. In essence, diplomatic functions, alien to the army, and the conducting of talks with states have been placed on the shoulders of the leadership of the CIS Armed Forces. It is not suprising that with this, far from everything was done as should be done in normal interstate relations. Of course, no one is insured against mistakes. But this is not the guilt, but the misfortune of the leaders of the CIS troops. Now with the adoption of the decision on the creation of its own army—and I want to stress once again that the decision was taken when other states had already started along the path of creating their own armed forces—and with the creation of its own Defense Ministry the situation will change. The Russian defense minister and military representatives must ensure, like in other countries, that it is not the military which decides questions of mutual relations with other countries. This should be done by political bodies, the Foreign Ministry, under the leadership of the president and parliament in cooperation with the Defense Ministry. We intend to increase efforts to form effective security systems within the framework of the CIS. Many states are beginning to understand that they risk falling into a power vacuum. We felt this during our last trip. In these conditions, a civilized transformation of the armed

forces is necessary as is the fulfilment of obligations in accordance with international agreements.

Esteemed People's Deputies, I would not like now from this podium to go into this theme, but it seems to me that the need has arisen for an urgent closed meeting of a number of Supreme Soviet commissions, and then the Supreme Soviet itself probably, to examine the situation with the Armed Forces in the CIS republics.

Trouble spots should be the subject of timely and paramount concern within the framework of collective security. By relying on existing opportunities and involving where need be the world community, we are striving to halt the bloodshed in Nagorno- Karabakh and to prevent an escalation of military actions in the Dniester region and in other conflict centers. We proceed from the standpoint that these conflicts can and should be settled by exclusively peaceful means on the basis of mutually beneficial compromises. An important direction in the activities of the Commonwealth is the stabilization of economic links and the development of economic cooperation on a civilized and mutually beneficial basis. In this area, too, multilateral accords are being supplemented by bilateral ones. The government has concluded trade and economic agreements for 1992 with all the CIS countries.

We regard the social sphere as an important area of cooperation within the framework of the Commonwealth. An agreement has been signed on pension provisions, as I already mentioned, and draft documents are at the preparatory stage on special guarantees for CIS citizens working in the north, rights and guarantees for settlers, and cooperation in the sphere of pension provisions for servicemen and members of their families. Over 150 ethnic cultural centers of the people of CIS countries have been set up in Russia's territory. At the same time, specific methodological and practical assistance is being given to the centers, societies, and communities of Russian Slavic culture that are being created in the territory of the CIS states. Russia will strive for the preservation and development of the existing information and cultural space.

There is obviously a need for the development of cooperation within the framework of the Commonwealth as regards internal affairs and state security bodies. There is a need in particular for joint action to stop the illegal traffic of drugs and arms which is gaining in force, and to combat organized crime, the threat of terrorism, and the plundering of the national cultural heritage. The conference of CIS member-state interior ministers in Kiev on 13 March approved a draft agreement on interaction in the sphere of combating crime. In February 1992 an agreement was signed on cooperation between Russia's Interior Ministry and Ukraine's Interior Ministry, and the texts of such draft agreements with Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan have been drawn up and agreed. Documents are being prepared on other forms of cooperation in this very important sphere. The Ministry of Security of the Russian Federation has signed an agreement on cooperation and interaction with the competent departments of Tajikistan and Kazakhstan. In the near future agreements will be prepared with Byelarus, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenistan.

Esteemed People's Deputies, in the situation prevailing today one cannot fail to speak about the prospects for Russian-Ukrainian relations. It is quite clear that we consider the preservation of friendly and fraternal relations between our states and peoples as one of the priorities of Russian international policy. Recently President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin again stressed this thought. Russia will persistently and consistently pursue a policy of respecting the national choice of the Ukrainian people and developing all-around cooperation with them.

One cannot fail to speak about the problems which have arisen in connection with Uraine's announcement of its new policy on economics and in a number of other spheres. Of course, if the course of disrupting existing economic links is taken, we will be obliged in the future to adopt commensurate measures to defend our economic interests. In particular, we will be obliged to raise the question of the strict observation by the Ukrainian side of civilized procedures for the withdrawal from the ruble zone and so on.

But we have always been in favor of resolving all problems with Ukraine by means of talks on the basis of universally recognized principles and norms of international law, CIS documents, and bilateral accords. The Russian side has put forward dozens of initiatives during this time to try to overcome tension in a number of spheres of relations with Ukraine. We have proposed setting up a permanent negotiating mechanism which would facilitate the construction of new Russian-Ukrainian relations.

It is from these positions that we approach the settlement of all the still unresolved problems connected with the Black Sea Fleet. As a result of the work of the Russian and Ukrainian delegations, it has just been agreed that official talks on these questions will take place in Odessa from 22-25 April. The resolution on the Black Sea Fleet prepared jointly by the Foreign Ministry and a number of deputies—which, as I understand,, is now being circulated—could well be very timely.

Esteemed People's Deputies, as far as the Crimea is concerned, we proceed on the basis of the agreement signed in Minsk on 8 December 1991, on the formation of the CIS, which envisages mutual recognition and respect for the territorial integrity of states which are members of the CIS and the inviolability of existing frontiers within the Commonwealth framework. I would like to stress these words—within the Commonwealth framework.

We also take into account here the fact that the abovementioned agreement was ratified by the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation and we hope that the

congress will support that historic decision. Yes, we are all worried about the Crimea and sympathize with the people of the Crimea. We cannot fail to take into account the special links which exist between Russia and the Crimea, and Sevastopol. It would be irresponsible for any politician—be it in our country or in Ukraine—to forget that. We have spoken of that frequently and openly in conversations at all levels, and we are continuing to raise that question to Ukrainian leadership. Here, responsibility is demanded on both sides, as well as special understanding from our partners.

Esteemed People's Deputies! The president, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, in connection with the formulation of the question about the Crimea, in the form in which it occurred yesterday and the day before yesterday, asked that the congress be informed of that, and he found that such a formulation, in that form, is untimely and potentially destabilizing. The fact of the matter is that the formulation of the question of the Crimea in such a form may give rise to a new upsurge of pseudo-patriotic forces in both Ukraine and in other republics and lead to the escalation of unfriendly moods and tension in interstate relations.

I would like to draw your attention once again to the thought that the strengthening of nationalistic aggressive forces beyond the frontiers of Russia will be turned, first of all, against the Russian-speaking population in the relevant state. That will also have a negative affect on more specific directions in politics. We have only just managed to beat down confrontation around the Black Sea Fleet—which I have just delivered a report to you on. We are embarking upon talks—just as the presidents proposed. It is important not to complicate the course of the talks on the ratification of the strategic offensive arms treaty, on the fate of the army, and on the mechanism for withdrawing tactical nuclear weapons for destruction on the territory of Russia.

Unfortunately, esteemed people's deputies, the CIS already has quite a lot of experience on exchanging outbursts and accusations. According to the president and government's deep belief, there should be no confrontation between our fraternal people, no matter how big the temptation is to be carried away by uncontrolled events.

Esteemed People's Deputies! Let me be honest about one thing. A duel between resolutions and the government might lead to its resignation. In similar duels, parliaments in other republics, unfortunately, cannot be dismissed. Anyway, we will have to live next door to each other and sooner or later to achieve agreement by civilized means. We need your concrete support in a form of well- considered discussion and ratification of international treaties, in a form of working out a common position on the most complicated issues, as relations with Ukraine and Japan, and the role by the army in the Transcaucasus and Moldova and also in other republics. But, it seems, it would be expedient to do it in a calm situation without overflowing emotions. We hope that this work will be carried out at the Supreme Soviet and its committees, and in this we rely on the support of the leadership of the Supreme Soviet. Thank you for your attention.

Kozyrev Answers Questions

LD1804222392 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 18 Apr 92

[Question and answer session with Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Viadimirovich Kozyrev from the Russian Federation's Sixth Congress of People's Deputies in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow, chaired by Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairman Vladimir Shumeyko—live]

[Text] [(Aksyutyev)] I am (Aksyutyev) from the 45th territorial. Mr. Minister, my question is this: You know the Russian Constitution, otherwise you would not be a minister. Article 104 states that only the Congress of People's Deputies possesses the competence to change the national state system of Russia. You know that the CIS agreement was ratified by the Supreme Soviet. Then there was a new agreement in Alma-Ata which was amended very substantially in Minsk, and not only with regard to the number of participants in the CIS, but also with regard to the content of that document. However, that agreement has not been ratified, even by the Supreme Soviet. My question is: How do you assess the legal foundations of the CIS, and on the basis of which documents do you act as minister?

[Kozyrev] I think everybody is familiar with the documents. This subject was debated at the Supreme Soviet. The president himself delivered a report. We answered questions. All these documents—the Minsk document and the Alma-Ata document, which set up the CIS—are well known. The Congress of People's Deputies was not in session at the time, but the Supreme Soviet was. In my view, it is a wholly constitutional body which was, in fact, formed by the Congress. The Supreme Soviet ratified an international agreement. This is its job. This is what normally happens in international practice. In all countries parliaments ratify agreements. By the way, I recall the standing ovation that greeted the ratification of this agreement. I think this was the only solution: Legally, politically, and economically.

Esteemed people's deputies, we all favor a reinvigorated Union, but it no longer exists. As you know, Ukraine voted for independence at a referendum. So, what can you do? Naturally, we all would like this instrument to be something like the agreement adopted at Maastricht, in Austria [as heard], but that has not happened yet. We will have to work toward that. Let us work together. Help us with the work. The entire government is seated here. They are preoccupied with this every day, concentrating on talks with the republics.

[Shumeyko] Thank you, Andrey Vladimirovich. Microphone 2, please.

[Astafyev] Deputy Astafyev, Moscow. Esteemed Andrey Vladimirovich, I would like to remind you of a resolution passed by the Fifth Congress of People's Deputies, to be more precise, an appeal to the peoples of Ukraine, Byelarus, and Russia. In November the Fifth Congress adopted an appeal to the peoples, asking them to preserve the Union and to stick together. This was just before the referendum in Ukraine.

I took this appeal to the Crimean Supreme Soviet and read it out there on behalf of our Congress. I explained our attitude to the referendum that was scheduled for 1 December. A few days later, when I was in Sevastopol, I saw your speech on television. It was broadcast several times by Ukrainian television. In your speech you called for the Crimea to remain part of Ukraine. You said this had been decided already, that our borders were inviolable, so to speak, within the Union. Even then, you still were promising that the union would continue, then you replaced it with the CIS, and so on.

Who has betrayed us? I was asked by inhabitants of Sevastopol. The Congress is in favor of the union, I replied. Evidently this is Minister Kozyrev's own position, I went on. But now you have changed key. You are telling us that President Yeltsin is also against rescinding the enactment of 1954, thereby passing the buck to him. Those were your words. Please clarify the situation. Who is betraying the Crimea? You alone? Or you and the president?

[Kozyrev] If it would be any easier for you if I were to say yes, that we betrayed the Soviet Union, that we betrayed the Crimea and so on, then all right, but what would that change? [shouts are heard from the hall]

[Shumeyko] Microphone 3, go ahead please.

[Kucherenko] Kucherenko, St. Petersburg. Andrey Vladimirovich, Andrey Vladimirovich, you have been distracted somehow. Andrey Vladimirovich, in the last part of your address you said several times that the president and the Foreign Ministry would like this question not to be decided in this hall today, and circumstances here confirm the thought that emotions are likely to be stronger than common sense and that we may whip up the situation even further in the Crimea itself and around it. Tell us please, can your words be assessed as a proposal to instruct the Supreme Soviet, the Foreign Ministry, the president, to elaborate that question once again and to remove it from today's agenda? [shouts from deputies]

[Kozyrev] Yes, I think the president's position should be understood in this way. As I said, his position is that an examination of that question at this moment is untimely, but on the whole, of course, the question still exists, and I would be in favor of keeping it in the field of view of the Supreme Soviet.

[Shumeyko] Thank you. Microphone 4.

[Surkov] Thank you. Surkov, 73d Kolomna. Mr. Minister, within the framework of the CIS, Russia, as the largest state, naturally is obliged to play first fiddle in guaranteeing human rights across the border, in the republics of the former Union.

Well, I have before me Article 56 of the law of Estonia on citizenship. Esteemed colleagues, just listen to what citizens of foreign states and stateless persons—that is to say hundreds of thousands of our compatriots—are deprived of: the freedom of political activity and the right to belong to certain types of associations; the right to choose their sphere of activity, place of work, and profession; the right to undertake entrepreneurial activity and to unite in societies whose aim is to receive income, the right to acquire certain types of property; the right to state assistance; and the right to receive information.

Andrey Vladimirovich, I have suppressed the inner feelings of irritation, anger, and inferiority complex against which you warned, as far as our fellow-countrymen are concerned. In the light of cold reason, I have to agree with what was said by Stankevich, a fairly liberal individual, that this is apartheid, pure and simple.

That is a considerable spit in the eye for the treaty ratified by the Supreme Soviet, for parliament, for your Foreign Ministry, for the president, and not least, for Russia itself. In connection with this, as the press reported, our Foreign Ministry, which is lacking in even the minimum virility, now, I think, is holding border talks about the Pechorskiy Rayon of Pskov Oblast. I am interested in your position on that question.

Second: Romania is taking part in the talks on the problem of the Dniester Region. My question is this: If Bulgaria, Hungary, and the United States ask to take part in them too, will you allow them as well? [applause]

[Kozyrev] Thank you, I have to say that not only in Estonia, but in the other Baltic states too, there are unfortunately violations that we at the Russian Foreign Ministry all know by heart. Incidentally, the remark about apartheid is, I think, borrowed from a Russian Foreign Ministry statement that takes issue with the Baltic leaders about this very matter. They are using outrageous terminology—I am sorry to have to say this, but it is outrageous—and really are passing such laws.

Esteemed people's deputies, the Russian Foreign Ministry has sent statements and notes repeatedly, we have draw the attention of the international community to this. At the Baltic Council, the voice of which I think the Baltics will have to heed because it deals with the area closest to them, we raised the question of setting up a special commissar on human rights and ethnic minorities. We made no secret of our position, but said frankly that what we have in mind is the defense of the Russian, Russian-speaking population. In other words, we are using all the means at our disposal to deal with this issue.

If we were to refuse to negotiate with these states altogether, I do not think it would strengthen our position. If we refuse to negotiate on borders, on strengthening the borders with those states, I think St. Petersburg will not thank us. On the contrary, Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Sobchak has asked me to speed up this work, and we now are accelerating it on the instructions of the Russian Federation president.

As for the Baltic region's territorial claims, I want to use the rostrum of this congress to reaffirm once again the position that has been expounded at a great many different forums and on a great many levels: We do not recognize any territorial claims whatsoever in the west, either by the Baltic states or by anyone else, or indeed, in any other region. I would like the congress to support that position, if only tacitly.

[Shumeyko] Right, thank you. Microphone 5, please.

[Bondarev] Deputy Bondarev, 89th district. Esteemed Andrey Vladimirovich, although you presented your report calmly and without thumping your chest, I think it convinced those who really wanted to hear it and who listened attentively. I would like to ask you to set out our government delegation's position at the quadripartite talks in the Dniester Region. Unfortunately, when Deputy Lisin and I arrived from Moldova we were denied a chance to speak during the preparation of a draft resolution on the Dniester Region, despite promises given to us. The point is that some deputies are still under the impression that the interests of the Russian Federation's population and the Russians were betrayed there. Thank you.

[Kozyrev] Thank you. I apologize for failing to provide a full answer to the previous question. As for Romania's participation in the talks we began with our two people's deputies taking part—their participation was very important and we hope it will continue—I would like to report that it was only yesterday, I mean today, at 0500 [0100 GMT], that we completed the second round of these talks, which we held on exactly the same basis as before.

Esteemed people's deputies, we all may like or dislike certain countries, but there is such a thing as geopolitical reality, and one reality is that Romania is a neighboring state. One of the sources of the most powerful emotional tensions, indeed the entire problem of the Dniester Region in general, is the fear of Moldova uniting with Romania. We were convinced of this when we visited the area together with the deputies.

You ask me here why we are trying to get Romania involved in the talks and are actually including it in the talks. This is because these talks are based, as was stated in Helsinki, on our recognition of Romania's independence and territorial integrity as a member-state of the United Nations and the CSCE. There are firm and clear-cut provisions, which were published in the press, on non-interference in Moldova's internal affairs. You do understand that all these provisions concern the other side too.

Apart from this, there are pro-Romanian moods in Moldova itself. This is a fact. What can we do about it? Ban them? No, we cannot do this, but we can try and channel these moods along legal paths, the path of not interfering in Moldova's internal affairs, and to seek their participation in peace-making efforts. In other words, to make them positive. I fail to see any alternative. That is why we are working there together with the Dniester Region representatives. I would like to tell you that yesterday we four foreign ministers talked for several hours with Smirnov, Marakutsa and other representatives of the Dniester Region leadership, and that they fully approved the measures we agreed upon yesterday.

The essence of what we agreed on is this: The truce reached during our talks is generally being observed, but there are isolated shooting incidents and violations of the truce by individuals because, as is admitted by both sides, there are uncontrolled armed units there—perhaps simply bandit forces—who are not subordinate to anyone at all. In such circumstances, we need mechanisms to ensure disengagement, mechanisms to compel compliance with the cease-fire, so that no provocateur or bandit can wreck the situation by shooting, even if it is into the air.

Yesterday I was told by representatives of the Dniester Region—I can tell you this as a bit of diversion—that someone at a wedding got a revolver and fired several blanks into the air to welcome the bride and groom, and immediately firing began all the way along the front in the district. That is how tense people's nerves are.

So we believe that the observation mechanism created—and I repeat, with the agreement of representatives of the Dniester Region—is now the only possible mechanism for preventing the situation from sliding into a Karabakh situation, in which any way back appears virtually unreal, such is the military confrontation.

I would like to ask you again, esteemed people's deputies: Let us look at all these issues calmly once again at some other time, at the Supreme Soviet or somewhere else. We in the committees are ready for this and we want this. We are asking for this. It does not matter who is shooting at whom in these troubled areas because something else is also important here, and that is that megaphone diplomacy and heroic poses, by me or by anyone else, lead nowhere, absolutely nowhere. We cannot send in a military helicopter for every Russian-speaking boy or girl in a school in Moldova, and I mean in Moldova, not in the Dniester Region. We also have to think about this. We have to consider the whole balance of interests. We cannot provoke Russophobic feelings in Moldova and irritation regarding interference by Russia because 75 percent of all the Russians and Russian

speakers living in Moldova are beyond the Dniester, on the right bank of the Dniester, you understand, in Moldova.

[(Isenko)] People's Deputy (Isenko), Moscow. I have the following question: How can the Congress discussion of the question of the Black Sea Fleet help the talks in Odessa? I refer especially to the context of this draft resolution, namely that it says that the Congress should support Yeltsin's decree on transferring the Black Sea Fleet to the jurisdiction of Russia. Will this not rather aggravate the situation still further and wreck these talks, which really could resolve the problem constructively? Thank you.

[Kozyrev] Perhaps we are talking about different drafts because there are several alternative drafts in circulation here. There is one version that is completely balanced, in my view, and that is the one on which our representatives from the Foreign Ministry are currently working. I think that if the Congress were to find the time to pass this one because—excuse me, perhaps we are talking about different versions—

[Unidentified speaker, interrupting] The point is that we have to examine a draft that states that this is agreed on with the Foreign Ministry. This is the officially submitted draft.

[Kozyrev] Thank you. I think this draft could play a positive role because it reinforces our standpoint, the president's standpoint, at the forthcoming talks without causing any damage to the other side, without whipping up hysteria. But we who are going to hold the talks would certainly like to be able to use the following argument: Look, we have the standpoint of the Congress, we have a standpoint from which we cannot retreat because this is the view of the People's Deputies, and so on. This kind of help seems to me entirely appropriate, and is in line with the practice of other states.

Shokhin, Shumeyko Cited on Cabinet Changes

MK1804082092 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 Apr 92 p 1

[Feature by Tatyana Malkina, Vladimir Todres, and Aleksey Zuychenko under general headline: "Government Has Decided To Engage in Policy of Congress—To Endeavor To Recreate the USSR"; feature incorporates report on correspondent interview with Russian Federation Vice Premier Aleksandr Shokhin and interview with Vladimir Shumeyko; place and date of interviews not given]

[Text] **Serious Change in Cabinet's Tactics**

"On the whole we entered the government as professional economists, but now—at this congress—we are also becoming politicians. But not political intriguers," said Russian Federation Vice Premier Aleksandr Shokhin when commenting on the preliminary results of the congress at the request of NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA's correspondent.

As for the numerous rumors about changes in the composition of the cabinet, Shokhin declared: "The congress has so rallied the government that now we have long forgotten about that. Basic changes will of course be made following the adoption of the Law on the Government. This concerns in particular the structure of the industrial management bloc [blok upravleniya promyshlennostyu]."

However, Shokhin deemed "a good option" the prospects of the introduction of Vladimir Shumeyko into the government: "It would be both interesting and easy for us to work with him insofar as, first, he understands our problems and, second, he is steeped in the structures of the Supreme Soviet and could help us to negotiate them better."

Aleksandr Shokhin elucidated the government's position on the recent critical observation by the World Bank that Gaydar's cabinet is moving "too quickly": "We are working in parallel both with the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund—these are two different teams. The fact is that the World Bank is geared to structural reforms in the key sectors—agriculture, energy, and so on; while the IMF is concerned with the problems of macroeconomic stabilization. The natural collisions between these two international financial agencies will also assist us in selecting the correct solution."

Shokhin also touched on future changes in government policy: "We will inevitably be forced to ease the monetarist pressure on the economy and get nearer to the real problems of stimulating production and the problems of the social sphere. We have now squeezed aggregate demand somewhat [v neskolko raz] and are now letting it go, but letting it go selectively—proceeding from our structural policy priorities. This is also difficult to do, since we are beginning to see the very strong influence of the various lobby groupings—Who will be able to extract the most. The government must therefore have precise priorities in its policy, and aside from that it must know how to resist."

Shumeyko Will Join the Government

[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA] People are saying that a post awaits you in the government?

[Shumeyko] So they are saying. But the president must decide. How can he make best use of me—as deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet for reform or within the government in the post of the premier's "operations deputy"? In the difficult transitional period you cannot get by with just one first vice premier. Yeltsin should now have two deputies: a "strategic" one who would

determine the course of the reform and make the necessary calculations, and a second one—an "operational-tactical" one who would apply this strategy to the specific tasks at any given moment.

[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA] That is why the deputies are demanding that Yeltsin give up the powers of head of the government and submit a new premier to them. There are rumors that it may be you....

[Shumeyko] Indeed, many people say: "We need a premier." But I say: "We don't need a new premier." Moreover, it is simply impossible to appoint one now. Why? Because the head of government is the one who picks the team. But the team has been picked, it is already functioning. Gaydar is at the head of it. Precisely he—although his formal title is only "vice premier."

It is intolerable in the transition period to change the government every three months. I am talking not about a new premier or a new cabinet but about the difficult process of acclimatizing new people in it.

[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA] There will still be some changes in the government? Will you be taking anyone with you?

[Shumeyko] I cannot put the question like that right now. Until an official decision is made I cannot pose the question at all. There is no decision as yet, only talk...

[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA] But an unofficial proposal?

[Shumeyko] Not yet. But this idea is in the air. The Industrial Union faction is insisting on the introduction of the post of "operations vice premier." At meetings the owners and employers say the same thing. The time is ripe. Do you remember that before it was a case of "there is an opinion"? Well, such an opinion does exist, and I believe that everything will be resolved in the next day or so.

The Congress Wants To Close But Cannot Do So

The question of the name of the state which erupted at the Congress of People's Deputies—just as it was on the point of expiring—was successfully resolved Friday [17 April].

At the insistence of President Yeltsin and a number of deputies, citizens of Russia who had spent days living in the state of Russia were, following a vote, transported to the "Russian Federation—Russia," which was enshrined in the present Constitution, this time evidently once and for all. The attempt to "take" the Russian state out of the USSR by removing any mention of the defunct Union from the Basic Law was frustrated by an opposition which mainly brought together communists, orthodox, and Russian nationalists. At the opposition's demand, the examination of this amdendment was postponed until the question of the CIS—the legitimacy of whose formation and existence continues to be disputed by some parliamentarians—is resolved.

The Russian parliamentary leadership's desire to put an end to the protracted congress as soon as possible and shift the debate about the CIS to the Supreme Soviet did not meet with understanding in the ranks of the opposition. At a Council of the faction held yesterday during a recess at the session its representatives demanded that the congress adopt a declaration announcing Russia's desire for the implementation of the results of the 17 March 1991 referendum and the creation of a commission for talks with the republics of the former USSR on the restoration of a Union state.

As Vladimir Isakov, former speaker in the Russian parliament's chamber of the republics, stated, if this is not done the opposition will take upon itself the task of holding such talks. The chief culprits responsible for the disintegration of the Soviet Union were named—President Boris Yeltsin and State Secretary Gennadiy Burbulis, who according to the representatives of the "Russian Unity" opposition bloc should address the congress and accept responsibility for destroying the state. However, in exchange for an appeal from the congress to "live together" to those who so desire, the bloc is prepared to drop the question of responsibility.

As the opposition stated, it will not allow mention of the USSR in the current Constitution to be dropped at least until the discussion of questions concerning the CIS is over.

Sergey Shakhray, who was present at the congress, told NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA that the restoration of the Union is impossible even by force of arms. According to him, the conservatives need a mention of the USSR in the Constitution in order to keep a springboard for the future, and also to be able "to assemble in the Kremlin in the future instead of in Voronovo."

The discussion of the question of the CIS will to all appearances become a reason for a renewed attack on President Yeltsin, who gained a victory in the discussion of the economic reform. This time, along with Yeltsin, the object of attack will also be the former political section of the government—Gennadiy Burbulis and Sergey Shakhray. However, the "vanished" President Yeltsin will scarcely change his tactics now and start responding to attacks by communists and nationalists.

Kozyrev Interviewed on Dniester Issue

LD1804224692 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1700 GMT 18 Apr 92

[Interview with Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev by P. Orlov in the Kremlin on 18 April; from the "Novosti" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Orlov] When he appeared in the Kremlin today, Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev emphasized that the representatives of the four sovereign states [at the talks in Chisinau on 17 April] endeavored first and

foremost to put an end to the armed conflicts. The measures they worked out are directed to this aim. [video shows Kozyrev and others walking inside the Kremlin; then close-up of Kozyrev]

[Kozyrev] In particular, there is the withdrawal of the armed formations to their permanent locations far off and for a long time, as was stated. There are also confidence-building measures to be taken by the two sides aimed at ruling out even the isolated exchanges of fire and isolated shots that we have had up till now. This will then open the way to a peace settlement, having in mind, of course, a determination of the political, economic, and legal status of the Dniester Region. But that is indeed the next stage.

What is important now is to preserve life and remove the tension. I think that we made progress. We agreed to assemble again after some time has elapsed with a view to seeing how it will be possible to make further progress. It will be a process of gradual movement to the end goal of a full normalization of the situation.

Deputy Calls For Army of 1.5 Million

LD1804220392 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1500 GMT 18 Apr 92

[Interview with Deputy Aleksandr Alekseyevich Kotenkov by commentator Irina Lapina at the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow; date not given; from the "Vesti" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Lapina] Let's turn to another event. A Russian Army has been established. To be exact, its right to be the Army of the Russian state has been legitimized. Sensible military reforms will obviously come. Let's hope that at long last a start will be made on untangling the web of contradictions. It is no secret that the situation in the Army is one of the most acute and sensitive problems.

Aleksandr Alekseyevich, where should reform of the Army start?

[Kotenkov] In my opinion, reform of the Army should begin with a reform of its central bodies, since it will be their job, in due course, to implement the reforms throughout the Army.

[Lapina] It is currently being said that about 2.5 million servicemen will fall under Russia's jurisdiction. What in your view is the optimum figure for reductions in the Army?

[Kotenkov] In developed, civilized countries, the Army does not normally exceed 1 percent of the state's population. Therefore, the maximum size of Russia's armed forces should be 1.5 million men. There are both political and, above all, economic reasons for this, since we simply cannot sustain a bigger army.

Council Appeal on Servicemen's Group Circulated

LD1904104192 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1534 GMT 18 Apr 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksey Tabachnikov]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—An appeal of the interstate council of soldiers' parents was circulated today among participants in the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies. It says that some 40,000 people died in the armed forces over the past six years, and nobody is held accountable for their death, "because the military prosecutor's office passes off all murders committed in the army as 'suicides' and 'accidents'."

Parents of the dead soldiers demanded in their appeal the approval of a provision about the committee for the affairs of servicemen and their families at the office of the Russian president, as well as the creation of an independent commission for conducting "impartial and comprehensive investigation of the causes of the soldiers' death, irrespective of the circumstances of the death and of how long ago it took place."

The appeal also demanded the payment of a compensation to parents of the dead soldiers to the sum of no less than 50,000 roubles, with due account for (?inflation), equal privileges for all parents who lost their sons while the latter were serving in the army in peace time, and pensions for them—to mothers beginning from the age of 50 and fathers beginning from the age of 55.

If our demands are not met, soldiers' mothers will gather outside the Kremlin walls and declare a hunger strike, the appeal said.

Report on CIS Economic Role Distributed

LD1804095592 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0922 GMT 18 Apr 92

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—Given the diversity of the Commonwealth countries' approaches to solving their problems, the line for economic transformations and mounting joint efforts to climb out of crisis wins general recognition. This thesis underlies a report on Russia's economic position in the Commonwealth of Independent States, which was prepared by the Russian Government and distributed among the participants in the Sixth Congress of Russian People's Deputies.

Russia's cooperation with the other Commonwealth countries is planned to be discussed at the Congress next week.

The authors of the report call for preserving and bolstering the rouble as a single monetary unit in the Commonwealth and for pursuing a coordinated price-setting policy within the Commonwealth.

The report says the Russian Government patiently continues talks with the Commonwealth states to coordinate the price policy but it intends "to uphold and defend the economic interests of its state in all cases."

At the same time, the government understands that economic interests of individual Commonwealth states may not coincide with those of Russia. The cabinet does not, however, regard this as a hurdle to the "close interaction of the Commonwealth states".

Report on Citizenship Issues Circulated

LD1804200892 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1811 GMT 18 Apr 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—The Russian Government believes it is "necessary and reasonable" to revise the existing rules of granting Russian citizenship as the second one to Russians—former citizens of the USSR and their direct descendants.

A report, prepared by the government, was circulated today among participants in the sixth Congress of People's Deputies. It says that the existing law on Russian citizenship of November 28, 1991, allows double citizenship "only by special permission and only with the countries with which agreements have been concluded on mutual recognition of double citizenship." The authors of the report believe the imperfection of the law creates a very difficult situation for the Russian-speaking population in the former Union republics, for representatives of all Russia's nations and nationalities who found themselves outside Russia.

Proceeding from this assumption, the government believes these people should be "given the right to receive Russian citizenship as the second one without any hindrance. Besides, it is necessary to simplify as much as possible the formalities connected with putting it into effect." Thus, Russia would take under its protection the compatriots, who found themselves outside their native land for reasons not depending on them.

The authors of the document suggest that the authorities should consider the simplification of formalities, connected with the obtaining of Russian citizenship by former subjects of the Russian Empire and citizens of the Russian republic, which existed before the 1917 communist revolution, as well as their direct descendants.

Report on Growing Migration Problem Noted

LD1804123992 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1045 GMT 18 Apr 92

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—Every fifth person in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) is a Russian citizen. About 28 million Russians, more than 1.1 million Tatars, 841,000 Jews, 148,000 Ossets and many members of other nationalities of the Russian Federation found themselves outside Russia following the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

These data are given in an analytical reference note which was circulated today by the Government of Russia at the Congress of People's Deputies in view of the forthcoming discussion of Russia's relationships with other CIS countries.

The new political situation has brought about new problems, including that of migration. The government's document points out that migratory mobility of Russians as well as members of other nationalities who live outside Russia grows for a number of political and socio-economic reasons.

Experts believe that "this process may markedly intensify in the coming years and assume global nature with serious, far-reaching consequences—political, economic and demographic".

According to the Russian Interior Ministry, more than 200,000 people have arrived in Russia over the past three years upon having to abandon the places of their permanent residence in the newly-independent states around Russia. The process becomes increasingly dynamic. The share of Russians in the migratory process grows noticeably.

This situation confronts the Russian Government with a number of no easy tasks. The major of them is to work out principles and forms for Russia's interaction with the former Union republics where Russian citizens live.

Factions Group Considers Replacing Khasbulatov

LD1804103992 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0800 GMT 18 Apr 92

[Text] We have already reported on the meeting of the group of factions from the Russian parliament which took place this morning. Answering a question from an ITAR-TASS correspondent about what they agreed on at that meeting, Vladimir Novikov, chairman of the Factions Council, reported that they seriously discussed the issue of whether to reelect the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Various points of view were expressed, he said, but one thing is clear: The majority are striving to make a decision which would stabilize the situation. Although some people think, he continued, that Khasbulatov acts discourteously and at times even discredits the deputy corps, despite that the deputies came to the conclusion that this issue is not the most important one today.

The participants in the meeting also discussed the fact that the problems of the Crimea and the CIS and the socioeconomic situation in the north must be examined at the present, drawn-out Congress.

Factions Support Congress Rehabilitation

OW1804135892 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1237 GMT 18 Apr 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The procrastinated congress needs an energetic ending, since it's the only way to rehabilitate it in the eyes of Russia's public, Vladimir Novikov, chairman of the council of parliamentary factions, told IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent. Summing up the results of a conference held by the leaders of factions in the Kremlin Saturday [18 April] morning, he expressed regret over the fact that the meeting failed to be attended by President Boris Yeltsin whose presence had been planned. According to well-informed sources, parliamentary leaders came to attend the meeting held by the coordinators of factions, and Boris Yeltsin decided not to hinder their conversation by his presence. The President is expected to confer with the leaders of factions on Monday.

According to V. Novikov, participants in the meeting intended to coordinate an agenda for the rest of the congress. Spokesmen for many factions insist on discussing such issues, as land reform and problems faced by the CIS. Besides, V. Novikov said, the congress raised the issue of re-electing the speaker of the parliament, the post currently held by Ruslan Khasbulatov.

According to Gennadiy Gorelov, coordinator of the faction "Democratic Russia", participants in the conference managed to gain consensus on only one question: the need to stop discrediting both the legislators and the executive power. As for the conflict between the parliament and the government, according to G. Gorelov, those to blame for its aggravation are speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov and Secretary of State Gennadiy Burbulis.

Shakhray on Yeltsin Nonappearance at Session

OW1804130492 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1237 GMT 18 Apr 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At its morning session on Saturday [18 April] the 6th Congress of Russian people's deputies turned down the call of the factions "Democratic Russia" and "Radical Democrats" for discussing the need to conduct a referendum on the private ownership of land.

Vladimir Shumeyko, deputy leader of Russia's parliament, told the deputies that the parliament will hold a session during a large interval in the work of the forum to consider social security issues.

When asked why Boris Yeltsin was not present at the morning session, presidential spokesman Sergey Shakhray explained that the head of state "is not obliged to attend all sessions of the congress, and the congress cannot demand that he give an account in this connection".

Line on Media 'Nostalgic' for Agitprop

PM2104104092 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Apr 92 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by "Editorial Office Viewpoint": "Congress Nostalgic for Agitprop"]

[Text] The decision by the Russian Congress of People's Deputies to refer the question of the mass media for examination by the Supreme Soviet cannot be regarded as even a minor victory, let alone a major one, for the mass media. But it is an undoubted loss for freedom of speech.

It had been expected that the press would be torn to shreds. But there are no grounds for thinking that this was the general desire of the deputies. It is now quite obvious that those out to get the press were the Congress Presidium.

The motives are obvious too. The three branches of power—the executive, legislative, and judiciary—have weighty reasons for coming into conflict with each other. But the authorities are united in their complaints against the press. And the more information the authorities would like to hide from the public, the more these complaints increase.

Unfortunately, our authorities do have things to hide. The government's secretive isolation, the groveling dependence of the courts, the high-handed incompetence of certain parliamentary figures, ambition, intrigues, corruption, abuse of power—those are just some of the vices to afflict the vital organs of the new democracy.

The Congress, which has given us the pleasure of observing the tiresome procedure of adopting amendments to our obsolete and doomed Constitution, would hardly run the risk of castigating the newspapers and television in the absence of reporters. Things build up in deputies' hearts from congress to congress. Some have questions ready for the press. Others have answers ready.

But they need an audience. They need readers in order to be read. Listeners in order to be heard. Viewers in order to be seen. Only the Congress makes it possible to solve this problem easily. Either by a simple vote, or by a roll-call vote.

By voting to refer the matter to the Supreme Soviet, the Congress has, of course, deprived itself of this great pleasure. But it has shown a high degree of obedience to its leaders. It has shown itself prepared to give up the tastiest dish for the sake of the peace and prosperity of its pastors.

Not all deputies are hysterically nostalgic for censorship. The position of the mass media entirely merits the parliamentarians' attention. If it is a question not of a punitive expedition but of an important sphere of public activity, then parliament's participation can be of benefit.

Here is a short list of the problems which entirely merit the legislators' attention. The leadership of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet finances its publications at the taxpayers' expense and consequently to the detriment of other publications. Tax concessions are being created for some of the mass media. The state, as monopolist, is using prices to stifle independent newspapers. Privatization is being pushed into the distant future.

Is the Congress which we have been observing during this period capable of determining the methods for solving such serious problems? Hardly. Too many deputies remember that newspapers are collective propagandists. Too few deputies have forgotten which building housed the Agitprop.

Comparison of Shumeyko Address to Congress

CM2104171092

Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian on 18 Apr 1992 carries on page 1 the economic reform declaration by the Sixth Congress of Russian People's Deputies. Comparison of the ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA item, entitled "Declaration of Support for Economic Reform in the Russian Federation," with the translation of the Moscow Radio Rossii version printed in the 20 April Central Eurasia DAILY REPORT Supplement beginning on page 24 reveals the following variations:

column two, first full paragraph, sole sentence, ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA reads: "...Council of Ministers (Government) of the Russian Federation and to bring it into force in accordance with the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies Resolution of 1 November 1991 "On the Organization of the Executive Power in the Period of Radical Economic Reform" and the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies Resolution of 11 April 1992 "On the Course of Reform in the Russian Federation."

The Congress states..." (rewording, picking up fifth paragraph)

fourth full paragraph, second sentence, ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA reads: "...to all states, international organizations, world public opinion, foreign entrepreneurial circles..." (repunctuating, inserting "world public opinion")

19 April

Three Main Parliamentary Blocs Formed

LD2004154192 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1100 GMT 19 Apr 92

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Anatoliy Antonov, leader of the social and strategic research center, told us the results of research which gives a comparative description of the arrangement of political forces at the start of its work and in recent days. If previous to the beginning of the congress there were 13 various deputies factions and associations which had various positions on key political issues, then at the present time three main parliamentary blocs have actually formed: the first bloc is Coalition in Support of Reforms, made up of the Radical Democrats, Democratic Russia, Free Russia, the Left Center, and nonparty deputies. At the basis of the association is support for the course of President Yeltsin and his government. The second bloc is Russian Unity, made up of the Communists of Russia, the Agrarian Union, and Fatherland of Russia. Characteristic of the bloc is opposition to the Coalition in Support of Reforms. The third bloc is the bloc of so-called Constructive Forces, made up of Smena-New Policy, the Industrial Union, and the Workers Union of Russia. This bloc is characterized by its support for the main direction of the reforms, but is not pleased with the forms and methods of conducting these reforms. The unification of these blocs took place under the key significant question of the development of the country. But an analysis of voting at the Congress of People's Deputies shows that on the whole the factions are not cohesive groups. Nevertheless, the most cohesion is to be found in the Communists of Russia faction, and the least in Smena.

Deputy Leaves 'Obsolete', Expensive Congress

LD1904184792 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1345 GMT 19 Apr 92

[By ITAR-TASS Correspondent Oleg Dzyuba]

[Text] Vologda (Central Russia), 19 Apr—"The Congress is becoming obsolete," stated Russian People's Deputy Nikolay Podgornov, head of the oblast administration, on Vologda radio. In his view, Russia needs a professional parliament.

It costs too much to hold Congresses, and the effectiveness of the work is too low. The deputy feels that those elected by the people should work in their okrugs and soviets, where they are in a position to be of real use. At Congresses however, many deputies are mainly trying to get attention.

Podgornov, who left Moscow on 18 April for talks with a strike committee of agrarian workers, has no intention of returning for the final meetings of the Congress. The deputy prefers to deal with the urgent problems of the oblast and is planning to get in touch with members of the Vologda delegation to clarify whether his vote is needed in the final count of views. If not, Pogornov's seat in the Congress hall will remain empty.

20 April

Congress Proceedings of 20 Apr Session

Morning, Afternoon Sessions

LD2004083792

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 0600 GMT on 20 April begins to carry live

coverage of the proceedings of the Russian Federation's Sixth Congress of People's Deputies from the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow.

At 0603 GMT the chairman asks deputies to register. The commentator notes that 878 deputies are present. The deputies begin to discuss the agenda. Discussion of the situation in the CIS is envisaged as well as the adoption of a decision on the state of affairs in the CIS. Deputies vote on whether to discuss the situation in the CIS or to embark on the adoption of the decision on the situation in the CIS immediately. The deputies vote in favor of discussing the report first.

It is noted that 91 deputies have submitted requests to the Secretariat asking for time to comment on the state of affairs and problems of the CIS. Deputies vote every point of the agenda individually. Khasbulatov is present. Procedural remarks continue.

At 0637 GMT deputies adopt the agenda in the main. An unidentified deputy does not want a direct relay of the discussion on the CIS. Deputies vote on this issue with the result that the relay will take place.

At 0642 GMT deputies vote on reconsidering standing orders—passed. The deputies vote on whether the discussion of the situation in the CIS should be broadcast on TV in full—rejected. Deputy Rybkin, representing Russian Communists faction, takes the floor. He condemns agreements signed in Byelarus saying that they only speeded up the break up of the USSR. He says that all decisions adopted and to be adopted at the congress are aimed at the break up of the USSR.

At 0654 GMT Deputy Chuykov, representing the Chuvash Republic, takes the floor. He says that a great tragedy—the break up of the USSR—has taken place. He says that the Communist Party is fully responsible for the current state of affairs. He also says that the restoration of Russian statehood is not possible. The CIS, he says, is losing its authority in a number of regions. He says that within the government there is confusion as to who is responsible for what.

At 0703 GMT Deputy Krylev takes the floor. He expresses his regrets that deputies voted against the closed discussion of this issue. He asks deputies to calm down and to think of people who live in trouble spots. Deputy Tolkunov then gives examples of foreign countries showing that a strong army is needed in any case. He says that U.S. missiles are still aimed at CIS industrial facilites. He says that the servicemen find themselves in dire straits.

At 0716 GMT Deputy Ryabukhin sums up the whole process of the break up of the USSR, and condemns those involved in it. Deputy Goryacheva says that the last two years have led to the disintegration of the Union, which even the fascists could not destroy. Russian territories and access to the seas have been lost. Russians in other republics have been betrayed. U.S. economists are dictating Russian policy: who pays the piper calls the tune.

At 0729 GMT Deputy Zaytsev for the Free Russia group says the Crimea should not be allowed to become the subject of a tug-of-war between Russia and Ukraine. The interests of Russians would be betrayed if the Crimea were turned into a new trouble spot. It is important to resolve the problem of nuclear arms control. The Kozyrev report demonstrated that the Foreign Ministry is in command of its foreign policy brief.

At 0734 GMT Deputy Kazayev rails against Georgia's actions against South Ossetia. Deputy Sidorenko says that nothing can come of the CIS. The Bolsheviks were interested in weakening Russia by raising the nationalities issue. We are not against the Commonwealth as such, but against the destruction that the Commonwealth has entailed.

At 0747 GMT Deputy Ambartsumov, speaking for Democratic Russia, says he supports the government policy with certain qualifications. When people like Isakov say they want to restore the Soviet Union, they should be reminded of realities. Deputy Astafyev says Kozyrev's speech was flaccid and lifeless, as it did not forcefully set out Russia's interests. The rights of Russians who find themselves abroad should be championed.

At 0800 GMT a 30-minute break is called and the relay ends.

The congress chairman, believed to be Filatov, reopens business. Deputy Bok takes the floor and reads out an appeal to the Congress by Nizhniy Tagil steel workers. He expresses support for Yeltsin.

At 0839 GMT Deputy Aksyuchits, representing the agrarian faction, takes the floor. He speaks against the break up of the USSR. He stresses that other republics shied away from the idea of the CIS, so in its essence, the CIS is a concept of disintegration. The concept of the CIS ought to be changed. The Russian leadership ought to keep unified armed forces subordinated to Russia. The Russian leadership ought to protect Russians living outside Russia.

Deputy Pavlov says that he is very indignant about the creation of the CIS. He says that there are two options. One is to restore country's statehood. The second one is a war because Russians will start to fight for their reunification. He stresses that people whose views are different from those of the government cannot get time on TV, hence, cannot be heard. He demands the restoration of the Union, otherwise, he says people will continue to be slaughtered.

At 0851 GMT Deputy Molostov calls upon deputies to think about the course of history. One cannot go back in time. What is done is done. Deputy Golovin takes the

floor and talks about Russia's interests and Russia's legal succession of the CIS. He says that the idea of the CIS is a dead idea.

At 0902 GMT the chairman says that 16 deputies have spoken so far. He suggests that Kozyrev and Khasbulatov have a chance to speak. The deputies vote for additional speakers to be given time. They are Baburin; Kulumbekov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of South Ossetia; and Lysenko.

At 0916 GMT a deputy from the Vladimir constituency takes the floor. He says that the supreme executive power must take some steps to settle the situation in the Dniester region. Deputy Volkogonov, representing the Left Center faction, takes the floor. He says that the break up of the Soviet Union is a sad thing, but one cannot go back on one's actions. The CIS does not have a firm concept of foreign policy line. Stresses in politics and relations with other countries ought to be shifted. For Russia, relations with Ukraine and Byelarus, for instance, are more important than relations with the United States or Japan. He says that Russians will carry on helping its citizens living in other republics. A security treaty ought to be signed by all the republics. The CIS needs reforms to strengthen the country and to learn to change in a civilized manner.

At 0930 GMT deputies Malkov and Novikov make procedural remarks. Then Deputy Baburin takes the floor. He reads out a letter received by him from one of his voters. The female writer asks for the resignation of the government and the president. He says that in the Constitution the Congress must preserve the point regarding the Congress's determination to set up the Russian state within a renewed union.

Deputy Kulumbekov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of South Ossetia, expresses his gratitude to the Russian Government for its role in his own life. He gives the history of the South Ossetian conflict.

At 0946 GMT Deputy Lysenko takes the floor. He says that all the problems ought to be reflected in the Congress's decision. He says that a patriot is a person who is prepared to take serious practical steps to save the country. Deputy Surkov takes the floor. He says that the Russian leadership should not ignore other countries' political will which they are prepared to fight for. Russia has a number of problems: lack of ports, the loss of Crimea and part of Kazakhstan.

Ruslan Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, takes the floor and says that it is a feature of the Slavs to feel guilt and to want to criticize themselves. Who is to blame for the collapse of the Soviet Union? Perhaps the revolutionary period was an aberration? And perhaps Brzezinski had been right to say that democratization in the Soviet Union would inevitably lead to the destruction of a flawed system? Perhaps each of us is guilty. Khasbulatov then outlines the background to the Soviet Union's demise: the need to decentralize the excessively centralized unitary state and the misguided debate on the Union treaty which had shaken the Union to its foundations.

He says that Russia did ratify the treaty, but the process faltered. The August events may have had their objective logic, but the fact is that they finally scared off the Union republics, accelerating centrifugal trends. For all their failings, the CIS agreements were a logical conclusion of the objective fact of the fall of a great empire. Many unifying factors remain: the railways, the monetary system, space, and people's real aspiration for unity. Khasbulatov says the criticisms need to be taken into account, but policy needs to be both flexible and tough.

At 1015 GMT Andrey Kozyrev, Russian foreign minister, says that the Congress has expressed the voice of reason and its views will be taken into account. But it would be wrong to accuse one another of betrayal. The president wants a federation, a confederation—Kozyrev says he spoke about this with him today. Russia has never opposed any integrationist proposals. To try to go back now on what has happened would create undesirable internatonal instability. People in the Dniester region want a normal life above all. Can those who call for heroism on the Moldovan question really guarantee they can deliver what they promise? Kozyrev thanks the deputies for their suggestions and says he is always prepared to listen to them. But there are no simple answers.

At 1020 GMT a break is announced and the relay ends.

Evening Session

LD2004143992

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 1201 GMT on 20 April resumes its live coverage of the proceedings of the Russian Federation's Sixth Congress of People's Deputies from the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow.

Filatov is in the chair and says that there are 23 different versions of the decison on the situation in the CIS. At 1203 GMT Deputy Yarov, head of Drafting Commission, speaks about his commission's work and reads out the version drawn up by the commission.

At 1209 GMT Filatov asks deputies whether he can put this draft decision to a vote. A deputy asks the congress to send an appeal to the court asking for proof of legality of the creation of the CIS. The draft decision is adopted as a basis.

An unidentified deputy from the Drafting Commission says that this draft decision has not been agreed upon with all factions. He wants deputies to have a look at another draft decision prepared by the Smena grouping.

At 1220 GMT a vote is taken on the appeal to Russians living in former republics—the appeal passes as a whole. Deputy Rebrikov talks about the decline of moral standards in the media. He asks the Presidium of the

Supreme Soviet to appeal to the constitutional court regarding the legality of president's instructions, 354 for instance, determining internal and external policy of the CIS.

At 1241 GMT deputies vote on ending microphone comments. The Congress wants to go back to discussing amendments but there are not enough people present, only 768.

At 1244 GMT Deputy Kuramin, government minister, delivers a report on the situation in the north.

At 1330 GMT Filatov asks for an hour's extension of today's session—turned down. A vote is taken on an extra half-hour—deputies say no.

At 1333 GMT Voronin, deputy chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, says that the issue of the north has not been discussed at the highest level for a long time. The north matters, and its role will increase further. But there are social strains and separatist tendencies in northern regions. Policy has hitherto been one of predatory exploitation of mineral resources. Government decisions have been made piecemeal without an overall policy, and no one has been prepared to take responsibility. A single strategy is called for. The Congress has to tackle both tactical and strategic tasks with regard to the north. The brain drain from the north must be plugged. The Supreme Soviet Presidium has recently adopted a decision on food supplies to the north. The Supreme Soviet would like pay scales and other social welfare matters in the north to be tackled. Pollution needs to be looked at. The state sector will continue to work alongside business in developing the economy of the north. There must be an effective mechanism for financing the whole programme.

At 1357 GMT a Secretariat official says that a new grouping—"Civil Society" (Grazhdanskoye Obshchestvo)—has asked to be registered. A number of people want to leave "Smena". Many messages have been sent to the Congress, four-fifths dealing with reactions to proceedings. He mentions a number of specific messages from members of the public. A deputy complains that deputies' enquiries have not been answered.

At 1406 GMT Filatov says the Constitution, the decision on the north, and organizational matters are to be dealt with tomorrow, which is still expected to be the last day.

The relay ends.

Kozyrev Addresses Congress

LD2004122792 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0830 GMT 20 Apr 92

[Address by Russian Federation Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev at the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow—live]

[Text] Esteemed people's deputies! I think the voice of reason finally has spoken after all. There really are a lot of critical remarks, and we are grateful to the people's deputies for them. We share a common pain and we all bear responsibility, you and I, on the basis of your decisions; remember your decisions on the financing of the Union, on the continental shelf, and other decisions which proceeded along the path of stripping the Union of state prerogatives? Perhaps we did a lot wrong, too, but I think that we would be mistaken to accuse each other of treachery. There was no treachery. A complex historical process is under way in which you and I are making mistakes, and we, acting according to a common policy, at your instructions, your mandate, also are making mistakes. However, we have always struggled for a renewed union and we are continuing to struggle.

Esteemed people's deputies! I also spoke with the president today. He is in favor of the Federation and for a confederation and has always spoken out in favor of this. Just recall Boris Nikolayevich's speeches. When did he speak out against the Union? We were the last to embark on the path of the decisions that wrote off the Union once and for all. Of course, the CIS, in all its forms—and I want to stress once again the thought I expressed to you yesterday—at every meeting, at the level of president, government, ministers of various trends, we always uphold the same position—we are prepared for any forms—integration, confederation, federation—if only our partners are prepared for them. I report to you once again that there has not been a single occasion when we have spoken out against integration agreements. So, we are trying to do everything possible, but esteemed deputies, it would be real treachery to reject the CIS now, too. The fact of the matter is that in this way, of course, we would offend the other republics, which are already so sensitive about their sovereignty. I do not think there would be anything positive to gain from that at all. The Soviet Union has not been reconstituted, but we would be stabbing in the back the Russian Federation now, too because chaos will arise on the international arena again. Remember the war of laws! After all, it began in the Soviet Union, not in the CIS. Do not let us recreate a situation in which Western states, other states, and our CIS neighbors will ask: "What kind of state do you have? Who are we dealing with?" and so on and so forth! That will inflict great harm on our economic reforms now.

Esteemed people's deputies! The example of the Dniester Republic was given here. To some extent, it is a textbook example. First, the president's position is known; it was reflected in the presidential declaration adopted in Kiev. This a classic example of how we can use force to side with those Russian-speaking people living on the territory of the Dniester Republic. It is unambiguous. But esteemed people's deputies, what sort of life would we like these people to have? To live practically in a military camp isolated by the Army from all surroundings? What sort of life do we want for them? Practically a ghetto in enemy surroundings? Or would they like to live in normal surroundings? During that

meeting of the foreign ministers and during the latest foreign ministers' meeting, I had meetings with Smirnov, Marakutsa, and other Dniester leaders, and we are working very closely together. They do not want such a life. They want to have a normal existence, just like ours, with normal neighbors, in normal surroundings, in the center of Europe. It is another matter that their status will have to be fought for, and we are fighting for it, but you can see how difficult it is making headway in this process. Seventy-five percent of Moldova's Russian-speaking population do not live in the Dniester Republic. I would like to raise this question once again: Are those who call upon us to strike heroic poses prepared to fly to every Moldovan school to fetch every Russian or Russian-speaking child, as we say? To take a military plane surrounded by guards and to protect his or her rights by force? Or should we ensure that this child goes to school in a normal way and lives in his own surroundings? Or maybe we want to have 28 million refugees from there just because our emotions are brimming over? Now, esteemed people's deputies, I would like to thank you for those proposals that were submitted here by Astafyev and other deputies. There were a lot of useful and specific proposals. Some of it we are doing, we are trying to do. I just want to say that whoever is the foreign minister—and resignation is the easiest option—but all those who have solutions or specific proposals regarding specific, you understand, specific ... not at a rally, but in real legal state work how to resolve this or that issue, please, there are representatives of the Foreign Ministry here. I am always ready to meet any of you. If it is not me, it would be another minister, our ministry and other departments. Here you are, there sit leaders of the Russian Government. Everybody is ready to listen to these proposals. I ask you to work in a constructive way and to support each other. I warmly support the speech of the Supreme Soviet chairman saying that, of course, we have to look for practical ways of tackling these issues. If you find a person who does it better, very well. If you do not, we will be looking for them together, but simplistic solutions to these issues do not exist. That is why I thank you for your criticism and your proposals once again. I stress that the government and the president are prepared to work on tackling all these issues in a constructive way together with the deputies' corps. Thank you.

Khasbulatov Addresses Congress

LD2004144192 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0830 GMT 20 Apr 92

[Address by Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov to the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation at the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow—live]

[Text] Esteemed presidium, esteemed people's deputies, I would like to say at the outset that the problem of personal guilt, introspection, and self-reproach belongs to the characteristic features of the Slavic soul, as writers used to say in the 19th century. It has become a national characteristic for us and practically all the peoples who have lived side by side for centuries within a single state, and exactly the same thing applies to many other features. So I can understand the speeches that deputies have made from the most varied standpoints. I can understand their innner motives, the attempts to provide answers to the questions of those who seek historic guilt in our decisions, the decisions of the congress, the decisions of the Supreme Soviet, and the decisions of the executive authorities. It is not just a question of a suffering heart and soul, of course. Rather, it is a deep bleeding wound which is, of course, characteristic of our fellow citizens and our deputies in a literal sense. So, as distinct from certain other matters, I do not intend to criticize anyone here or praise them in some fashion. All are worried by the same problems. But can we provide a reply today to the specific question of who is actually to blame for the disintegration of the Soviet Union, as we are trying to do. Perhaps our well-known Russian historian, the former director of the USSR Institute of History [not identified], was right when he boldly said back in the early 1970s that the October Revolution and the subsequent principles of the creation of the Russian state were a deviation from the historical process. And perhaps Zbigniew Brzezinski was also right when he wrote at the same time, in the early 1970s on more than one occasion, that as soon as the process of democratization started in the Soviet Union the latter would be doomed to extinction because the interethnic factor, based as it was on a flawed foundation, would come to the fore. This was a generally correct understanding of the fact that our actual system had become obsolete in the form in which it existed and made it necessary in April 1985 to make major changes. It is another matter how and in what form these changes were effected.

In connection with this, if one speaks about our historical blame—I have already said this—we can also be blamed. It is most possible that this is right. Every one of us—the leaders of the Supreme Soviet and naturally myself—do not decline part of the responsibility. But I would like to remind you that our declaration—in particular paragraph five and the division of the responsibilities and duties between the Union and the Russian Federation—did not in any way mean, I would like to categorically state, that we laid the foundations for the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

Look, what was written down there about the Union was about practically all the main functions that make a state a state, a single federative state. This means a single armed forces, a single railway network, cosmic space, a defense military-industrial complex, communications that include satellite communications, and many other things. If we had been carrying out our activities together with the central leadership within the framework of the declaration and within the framework of even paragraph five then, as I see it, we would hardly get the consequences that we have to unfortunately witness today.

After all, the issue was about the declaration on sovereignty. The experts have studied it and have come to the

conclusion that this declaration was actually not about sovereignty. It was about the decentralization of the unnecessary unitarian character of the federative state.

If you recall the report made by then Prime Minister Vlasov, I am quoting by memory, he actually said that a single national economic complex does not exist in Russia since all the branches have been transformed into unified centralized structures that service not only the interests of the Soviet Union on the whole but the world's need in raw materials. This is what had been said by the prime minister who was called and is called by many—justifiedly or maybe without grounds—a conservative. This is what it was all about and why we did not blindly vote for it. We voted with full understanding of the issue. So the blame does not lie there.

To be precise, you will ask where the blame lies. The only thing I can do is to give my opinion. I did this at the second congress when you demanded a report about the work of the Supreme Soviet on the Union Treaty and the Federation Treaty. I, personally, think that one of the main reasons that excluded the possibility of a gradual tranformation to a new qualitative state of affairs is the problem around the Union Treaty.

This legal problem was unfounded. In the constitutional sense it is not even worth mentioning: it was an anticonstitutional problem. The first Union Treaty was incorporated in the three subsequent constitutions and lost content as such. I do not know whose bright idea this Union Treaty was or which advisers were involved; as a well-known theorist would have said, it is being foisted on us. This idea of a Union Treaty was somehow insinuated. Well, it was presented, let me remind you, by figures from the Baltic region. After fierce debate had begun over this Union Treaty, they retreated from it by declaring at first their economic and then their political independence. And the fierce disputes over what the nature of this Union Treaty should be weakened the Union state and shook it to its foundations. Let us be both self-critical and thoroughly fair. We were among the first to make up a delegation to sign the Union Treaty. We ratified that Union Treaty at the Supreme Soviet. We were aware of the threatening danger, and for all the contradictions that existed among the various political views of our deputies in the Supreme Soviet, we went on to ratify it and created the appropriate commission for its signing. But unfortunately that process did not proceed. That process, and evidently also the politicians and statesmen, have now lagged behind the march of time. It is entirely possible that the August events also had a logic of their own, and their own objective character. We are hardly likely in the near future, or even for years, to learn the whole truth of those events. But it is also true that those August events frightened the Union republics to death. Frightened them to death. As soon as the central administration—or rather, the state as such—was seen to be fatally wounded, and the prestige of its state institutions undermined, above all the supreme institutions of power and the bearers of that power, it is natural that the centrifugal forces enormously increased their flight.

True, here the historians will probably be curious about one question: it is a period of extraordinary passivity of the state and its leaders between the end of August right up to the beginning of the work of our fifth congress. This period remains a mystery for me, of the extraordinary passivity of the state. It seems to me that it is the preparation for the fifth congress that has saved us from final collapse—of the Russian Federation, at least. It aroused the executive power from its slumber and we somehow managed to begin doing something. In that period, unfortunately, practically all the Union republics embarked upon the path of independent development. Analyze it, please. Therefore, the Belovezhskaya [Pushcha] agreements, for all their external controversy, and possibly certain legal and constitutional shortcomings and omissions—here I am fully in agreement with the esteemed Deputy Dmitry Antonovich Volkogonov and a number of other deputies—those agreements were, to our enormous regret, the logical completion of a fait accompli, namely the fall of a great empire. About the CIS: Yes, you are right, esteemed people's deputies. Yes, both those who praise and those who criticize. As yet it is indeed a weak but healthy baby. But if we want to preserve the hope of some sort of unification in the future, say in confederative form, then let us support the line of creating and accelerating that process of community within the framework of that same CIS. We are hardly likely to have another opportunity in the next few years for implementation. So we must support these treaties, which I am also not enraptured by, I assure you, enshrined in the community, including the agreement on an interparliamentary assembly—incidentally, a splendid rostrum for deputies of the former republics to meet and discuss just these problems, including those of our fellow citizens, including the problem of the armed forces and much else. Just look at it: we have reason to say that the movement, the progressive of the community, could very well take the confederative path. What are the objective, material factors, as it were? We have a unique power industry system, truly unique in the world, and a unified defense complex. Not one of the former republics is capable of forming such a complex in the next decades. unless we have the closest cooperation.

Further, we have a unique railroad system. Attempts to form some kind of separate railroad system are fruitless. It is a unified system and cannot operate in any way other than as a unified railroad system. Specialists realise that. We still have a unified monetary and credit sphere, although our finance policy obliges every republic to introduce its own monetary unit. That is not what the former republics desire. Then there is space, too. On the whole, these are all the factors for the gradual formation of a confederative association and, most importantly, of course, there is the inclination of people who have lived for centuries in a real commonwealth.

We saw that once again in Alma-Ata. I apologize but I want to recount just one episode. I was a guest of the chairman of the Kazakhstan Supreme Soviet—I stayed behind a day. He took me about 200 kilometers away

from Alma-Ata. We met shepherds there, and the only thing they have is those wireless sets. We stopped the motor vehicle. We got to talking. They asked if we were politicians and we said we were. Well, what can you say; of course, we will not say thank you, although we will be hospitable, they said. You wrecked the Union—now it is up to you to unite. So much for nationalism, it would seem. Therefore, people really desire that unity.

Esteemed deputies! I am finishing. I would like to call upon you to take account of all of that criticism. Of course, it should be taken into account. It is just. The criticism about the inefficiency of our activities as far as protecting our fellow countrymen is concerned should be taken into account also—namely, why don't we defend them resolutely when not just our civilians, but also officers and soldiers, are insulted. I do not understand that, either. And I fully share the opinion of deputies who raise these questions. Policy must be flexible, on the whole, but it should also be tough. Therefore, our professional diplomats and politicans should not forget the combination of these two elements.

I thank you for your attention and I ask you, esteemed deputies, to adopt that, on the whole, good and well-considered decision that was prepared by our commmission! Thank you.

Yarov Addresses Congress

LD2004164592 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1203 GMT 20 Apr 92

[Speech by People's Deputy Yuriy Fedorov Yarov, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet and member of the Drafting Commission, at the Russian Federation's Sixth Congress of People's Deputies at the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow—live]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The proposed draft decision from the editorial commission notes that the CIS is a new legal and political form of voluntary association of sovereign states. At the same time, the level of integration does not correspond to the tasks of political, economic, and military cooperation among the member-states of the CIS and it requires further development.

It is also necessary to consistently defend the foreign political interests of Russia and the rights of Russians living in other states on the territory of the former USSR. The main directions of Russia's activity in the CIS are considered to be the following:

The expansion of the contractual and legal basis of the Commonwealth on the basis of equal rights, mutual benefit, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs;

Ensuring the rights and freedoms of Russians living in other states on the territory of the former USSR;

The promotion by all available means of the preservation of a common economic space and the development of appropriate mechanisms for economic links among the member-states of the CIS;

The consistent pursuit of a policy of averting situations of conflict within the CIS;

And ensuring unwavering observance of the political, economic, and military-strategic interests of the Russian Federation.

It is considered necessary to instruct the Supreme Soviet and the Government of the Russian Federation to continue their work with interested states in the Commonwealth toward strengthening the development of coordination institutions with the goal of carrying out an agreed upon economic, monetary, currency, and customs policy and bringing the legislation of the republics closer together, in particular as it concerns social and economic matters in the sphere of the rights of citizens of the member-states of the CIS; and also to approve the creation of an interparliamentary assembly of the member-states of the CIS. The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet must ensure that the people's deputies of Russia participate effectively in its work.

Esteemed People's Deputies, we submit this draft to the Congress for its decision and request permission to examine the other drafts and materials at the Supreme Soviet following the talks among delegations, with the participation of Russia's people's deputies and the representatives empowered by the president to conduct those talks with the delegation from Ukraine. Thank you.

Kuramin Addresses Congress on North

LD2104001892 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1244 GMT 20 Apr 92

[Report by Vladimir Kuramin, chairman of the state committee of the Russian Federation for the social and economic development of the north and minister of the Russian Federation, at the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation at the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow—live]

[Text] Esteemed People's Deputies! The north is an immense region, covering 11 million square kilometers and taking in nearly two-thirds of the territory of Russia. It plays a leading role in providing the country with fuel and energy resources and many types of products from the mining, timber, and fishing industries. It has to be stressed that while possessing 9 percent of the labor resources and 15 percent of the fixed assets, the north produces nearly one-fifth of Russia's national income. For a broad range of natural resources the region will continue to occupy a key position in the long term. At the same time it is practically our last wild nature reserve and an extremely important regulator of the biosphere.

The departmental approach to mastering the north that arose in the past turned it into a source for raw materials for the union economy and generated a number of

serious problems. These include a lower level of social development, the degradation of the ecological system, and a deterioration in the environment for supporting the livelihood of minority peoples.

The first steps in generating a market system have worsened the situation in the north. Although the difficulties being experienced by the region are characteristic of Russia as a whole, some of them have become particularly acute here. The supply of food products and consumer goods to the people of the north has deteriorated, and the picture of the population's incomes has been altered. If previously they considerably exceeded average Russian incomes, then during the recent period the differences have largely been eroded. The drain of young, highly qualified staff from the north has increased. The actual formation of the market structures themselves is also progressing with difficulty, and territorial budgets have found themselves in a grave condition.

The government has been implementing measures aimed at resolving these problems. A resolution has been adopted on benefits for the regions of the far north, and also for the Komi and Karelia republics; Yakut-Sakha, Arkhangelsk, Murmansk, Sakhalin, and Tyumen Oblasts; and a number of other areas. A state program for developing the economy and culture of the minority peoples of the north for 1991-5 has been endorsed, for which 6.4 billion rubles [R] has been earmarked in terms of 1984 prices. About R27 million was allocated in 1991, and about R300 million this year, from the regional development fund just for regenerating ethnic villages and ancestral farms.

All this has made it possible to take the edge off the problems of the north, and even to resolve some of the critical situations that have arisen in one region or another. But it has not as yet proven possible to remove social tension. What is the reason for this? We believe the main cause lies in the fact that in developing legislative acts, resolutions, and directives on the transition to the market, insufficient account was taken of the specific conditions of the north. Practice has shown that the transition there has to be more flexible and cautious.

In order to correct the situation the government considers it essential to immediately resolve three tasks. First, to prepare proposals applicable to the conditions of the north for making changes to current legislative acts concerning privatisation, pricing, and taxation, which might make it possible to soften and at the same time speed up the development of market relations. Privatization in the region, for example, is made difficult because of the temporary residency of a substantial part of the population, the exhaustion of a number of mineral deposits, the frequently extreme depreciation of fixed capital, and the comparatively low profitability of production and effectiveness of capital investments in key sectors. This anticipates a more moderate pace and rather different approaches to the removal of state ownership. It is primarily necessary to preserve national ownership of the strategic resources of the north, which are a factor in the stable functioning of the national economy of the Russian Federation. This is also borne out by experience abroad. Thus, 60 percent of the land and mineral resources of Alaska, and all of the far north of Canada, is under the jurisdiction of the central governments.

The second task is ensuring the supply of food, consumer goods, and material and technical resources to the north. For this purpose, trading organizations have been allocated R6 billion from the budget to create working capital, and R3 billion to make up 10 percent of the 20 percent for credits for seasonal deliveries [not further identified]. The government has requested that the Supreme Soviet have the State Bank grant R29 billion of credit for 1992 deliveries. A special commission has been set up to supervise the deliveries. In matters concerning deliveries to the north, we do not intend to renounce previous experience, but at the same time their mechanism has to be changed. It is essential to interest supply enterprises in concluding contracts with the northerners while preventing them from extorting terms under the so-called barter exchange. Something that merits support is the proposal for consumers to buy shares in existing storage bases and for the construction of new ones, based on the interests of the northern territories, including in Nakhodka, Aldan, and Tommot, with an overall area of more than 55,000 square meters. The specific features of the region will be reflected in the provisions currently being finalized on supplying production and technical output and commodities.

And the third immediate task: To reduce social tension in the north, we consider it essential to create a system of guarantees and compensation, making it possible to cut losses stemming from the transition to the market, to keep unemployment down, and to ensure the protection of those sections of the population that are unable to work or are badly off. The relevant bill prepared with the trade unions will make it possible to solve some of these problems for a certain period of time. At the same time it appears fundamentally important to develop a new mechanism of guarantees and compensation for the people of the north in line with the economic relations that are emerging. The point is that the current system is built on approaches that have been refuted by experience—and that have generated leveling—and on the possibility of gaining unearned income and concealing economic parasitism.

Esteemed people's deputies! We are not talking about depriving people of privileges that compensate for higher living costs compared with other regions and that give them an incentive to go and work in the north. But the government believes that centralized grants for setting wage rates, various benefits, supplementary payments, and so on should be given not to a specific worker, doctor, or official, but to enterprises and territories, with due account, I stress, of state interests in their development. The task of the economic and territorial organs of administration lies in translating these grants into the

language of terms of contracts concluded by employers and employees. For those just arriving in the north, such a system could begin as early as the beginning of next year, and for those working under previously concluded contracts, on their expiry.

Scientific criteria for categorizing territories as Northern regions should be an important instrument for the implementation of this. You know that such criteria have been developed, and you have them at hand. By the end of the year, the borders of the North and of its internal divisions will have been refined.

The government has instructed the relevant ministries and departments to draft proposals on all of these issues, including some for subsequent submission to the Supreme Soviet.

New problems, ones that go beyond the framework of the Russian Federation, have also arisen. Among these are issues of preservation of citizenship during the time that one works in the north, payment of pensions in connection with northerners' return to their previous places of residence, and other things. They could be resolved on the basis of bilateral interstate agreements with the countries of the CIS and those that are not part of the Commonwealth.

I must emphasize that the measures listed are urgent priorities. Along with them it is necessary to begin right now to draft longer-term proposals, without waiting for the general stabilization of the situation in the country. This requires the development of a new state strategy—or, one might say, a new philosophy concerning the north. The outline and basic guidelines for the socioeconomic development of the northern region for the next 15 to 20 years that have been drafted at the instruction of the president and the government by the state committee for the north, together with a large team of scientists under the direction of academician Granberg, could serve as the scientific basis for this. In our view, they deserve unconditional support.

First, the main idea of this document, which consists of a transfer from the model of industrial development of the north based on departmental interests to the model of steady development on the basis of a multi-sector economy that has at its focus the interests of people and the improvement of their environment. Second, there is its foundation in principle, which comprises an integrated approach to development of the north and the combination of nationwide and regional interests, along with state regulation of the transition to a market economy and the reinforcement of territorial principles in management of these processes. Third, the pivotal line of state support for minority peoples of the north, and the key principle here, that these peoples be granted the opportunity to choose how they would prefer to live, preserving their national way of life. Fourth, the diversification of the socioeconomic development of the northern regions in accordance with the rate and penetration of the implementation of economic reform. Fifth, the long-term thrust toward eliminating the imbalance between the material and nonmaterial spheres, an end to the degradation of the ecological system, and improving the level of social protection for the population.

People's deputies already have the outline and the basic guidelines, as well as reference material, so I shall dwell on just a few of the key problems of the socioeconomic situation in the northern regions and possible ways to solve them.

First of all, substantial adjustments are required to social policy. In the health field, for example, the creation of a system of personnel selection for work in the north is envisaged that takes into account the ability to adapt to the harsh climate. Drafting a "Children of the North" plan is already nearing completion in the sphere of care for mothers and children. This is primarily devoted to health, since the long polar night, the strong electromagnetic field, low temperatures, and so on have their most negative effects on children.

In the sphere of culture, the drafting of special plans is envisaged, including preserving the cultural heritage of minority peoples. History lives through memories, as the Mansi writer Yuvan Shestalov empasizes; memories not only in textbooks, but also in the people. The northern peoples have created unqiue cultural monuments 4,000 and 5,000 years old.

A separate town-planning policy: This envisages that the people of the north be provided with housing and social facilities that are in accordance with scientifically established norms.

Taking this as a basis, the estimated capital investment in the nonproduction sphere amounts to R320-380 billion. It is understandable that in view of the current socioeconomic situation in the country, this task can only be resolved toward the end of the forecast period, and then on the condition that nontraditional approaches are used. One of these is to reduce the overpopulation of the north, which, according to certain estimates, amounts to about 20 percent. For this reason, there seems to be a future in the creation of conditions for the emigration of surplus population to other areas, mainly from the almost one million pensioners. As sociological research shows, up to 70 percent of them say today that they wish to leave the north.

Work on forming joint-stock and other enterprises to build housing and social facilities for northerners has already begun. Certain benefits are envisaged for these associations, and also for the territories where construction will be carried out. Another nontraditional approach: proceeding from the need to create good living conditions and to reduce expenditures and the ecological burden, we should restrict the construction of towns and work settlements in areas of new industrial development. People should be settled chiefly in towns located closest to these areas. Meanwhile, in order to resolve production tasks, the broad application of the tour of duty method is anticipated. Naturally, such a twist in town-planning

policy will require a special construction industry. This means the production of mobile housing settlements with all the necessary community and everyday facilities. Incidentally, this will also make it possible to solve permanently the problem of the so-called dead settlements, which have arisen in connection with geological survey work, with the development of small deposits, and with forestry work.

The paramount issue for the north is the stable supply of food for its people. In view of the fact that centralized supplies will in time give way to market forces, we intend to attack the problem on two fronts.

First, through an increase in local production of food. There are opportunities, and considerable ones, in this aspect. For example, in the European part of the north the production of meat in the last 20 years—as of 1990—increased by two to 2.5 times; of milk by 30 percent; and of eggs by a factor of 3.4. This has made it possible to increase their share of the total supplies for consumption to 69 percent. The region's potential for development of hothouse farming based on secondary thermal resources—thermal water and other sources of heat—is far from fully used. We need to build another 750-780 hectares in addition to the existing 380 hectares of hothouses and greenhouses in order to provide the minimum requirement for fresh greens and vegetables.

Second, an area that is new: the essence of this is to create a food base for the north on adjoining krays and oblasts in the non-chernozem zone, southern Siberia, and the Far East, where they traditionally supply agricultural produce outside their own territory and where they have a large quantity of little-used or derelict land. With this aim, it is planned to create a state land stock there, and over ten years to organize associations of peasant farms and joint-stock and other companies, mainly using funds from enterprises that use the north's products. It is intended that the northerners will conclude long-term agreements with these farms to supply meat, milk, potatoes, vegetables, and animal feed in volumes that in the long-term will make up for centralized supplies.

The task of resettling the north's surplus population could be tackled at the same time. The practice of the gold-diggers of Chukotka, the gasfield workers and geological surveyors of Tyumen, the metallurgical workers of Norilsk, and the miners of Vorkuta convinces us that this approach is correct. They are already energetically settling the agricultural lands of Kaluga, Ryazan, Kurgan, and Tula Oblasts and of southern Krasnoyarsk Kray. A draft government resolution has been drafted on this. Its implementation would require R27-30 billion.

The government believes the restoration and preservation of the north's natural environment is one of the most important areas of state policy there. We see the principle of this as developing special, stricter ecological norms and the creation of special zones with the very strict control of the use of natural resources.

This means nature preserves and national parks, and limiting economic activity to a scale that provides for the extraction and processing only of those natural resources that other regions cannot provide. In order to reach an ecological-economic balance, the nature conservation program needs, according to the calculations of Western scientists, at least 3 to 4 percent of GNP, rather than the 1.2 to 1.3 percent that is allocated in our country. We approach the prospects for the development of the fuel and energy, mining, forestry, and fisheries industries of the region from such a balance. It is particularly important to ensure the optimum functioning of the man-economy-nature system. We cannot allow distortions here or the artificial setting off of certain interests against others. Naturally, we bear in mind here the objective demand of the national economy for the products of these industries.

The fuel and energy sectors are undoubtedly at the top of the list. Taking account of the role they play in providing for production and for the population, and in creating exports, these industries must, in our view, be in the sphere of the strategic interests of the Russian Federation both today and in the future. We deem it expedient to develop a state program to develop the north's oil and gas industry. Taking into consideration the economic and ecological interests of other countries, we could think about attaching international status to it. As for the extraction of coal and the production of electricity, it is expected that these will be oriented primarily toward meeting the internal requirements of the region. We need to drastically increase the power of machinery and bring the electrification and heat supply of towns and settlements to the level corresponding to comfortable living conditions for the population. To this end, it would be fitting to speed up the completion of compiling a scheme of electrical and heat supplies to areas of the north and the arctic. Depending on the opportunities for investments, the plan to develop the fuel and energy industry is estimated at R25-42 billion per year.

Overall, the national economy's requirements for products of industries that exploit nature should, according to calculations, stay at the current level, and for some types it should even increase. In order, meanwhile, to ensure the balance between economy and ecology, we are to partially change the geography of workings of resources, and in a number of cases opt for a reduction in extraction of raw materials, while at the same time sharply increasing the level of comprehensive utilization of them.

We see as the basic resolution of the problem the creation of a multisector structure for the north's economy. This concerns first and foremost the augmentation of the oil and gas industry with modern enterprises for the deep processing of hydrocarbon raw materials, the development of woodworking production lines, and an increase by a factor of 1.9-2.2 in chemical and chemical-mechanical processing of timber.

Esteemed People's Deputies! We realize that in today's conditions, wide-scale diversification in the north is not realistic. The resources of local budgets barely make it possible to meet the most acute social gaps, as they say. The options of the state budget are also limited. Even construction projects that have already been started for enterprises for deep processing of hydrocarbon raw materials in Surgut, Novyy Urengoy, Nizhnevartovsk, and other places have been frozen. Hopes for capital investments by private business and foreign investors have not been justified yet, either. In the situation that has come about, the centralized funds being allocated to the north have to be used to the greatest effect. The creation of start-up conditions for developing a network of small- and medium-sized enterprises could be one direction. The foundations for this work have been established. Using funds allocated by the state committee for the north, opportunities are being created for the working of low-yield wells and the deep processing of oil in Tyumen Oblast, for recycling wastes from nonferrous metallurgy in Maritime Kray, and for producing plastics from timber wastes in Irkutsk Oblast. Tribal community enterprises called (Nodar), (Olenevod), (Evers), (Neyvrova), and a number of others have been formed in Magadan and Sakhalinskaya Oblasts and in Khabarovsk Kray, and are engaged in processing fish, venison, and fur and leather articles.

May I note that all the enterprises mentioned are classed under differing forms of ownership, and have been formed at the initiative of territorial administrative bodies. We view this work, on the one hand, as real progress into the sphere of market structures, and on the other hand, as the first steps in the realization of the outline and basic guidelines for the development of the region.

The need to preserve and enhance the role of the production potential that has been created has faced us with a complex task. The matter concerns the development of traditional trades and farming of the minority peoples of the north. Industrial methods of development have already led to their losing large territories to the exploitation of natural resources, and have drastically reduced biological resources. For example, of 300 million hectares of reindeer grazing, 30 million hectares have already been taken out of use. In the Khanty-Mansiysk and Yamal-Nenets autonomous okrugs alone, 28 fishing rivers and more than 17,000 hectares of spawning and feeding grounds have been ruined, and fish catches have dropped by 9,000 tonnes.

The problems that have accumulated over decades demand a solution. To this end, we envisage development of power engineering in areas that do not have centralized power grids, increased production of mobile homes with independent mains-type facilities, snowmobiles, hunting gear, and small refrigerated vessels for reindeer-breeders, fishermen, and hunters, as well as training for traditional trades.

A number of problems require legislation. These include establishing areas where traditional trades are practiced and granting them the status of zones with a special power for the exploitation of nature; the transfer to local bodies of the right to decide on issues of allocating reindeer pasture and of hunting and fishing grounds; the issuing of licenses and setting of ceilings for the hunting of wild animals, fish, and sea animals; and the maintenance of centralized budget finance.

We see the solution to the task facing us in the drafting of a kind of map of the utilization of nature in the north. On this map, the outlines of areas for industrial development, traditional trades, and nature industries protected by the state should be marked out clearly. These and other proposals will be reflected in the draft law on use of nature in places inhabited by minority peoples of the north.

We view the acceleration of scientific-technological progress, while ensuring that it has a social aspect, as a decisive factor for the development of the region. Science and technology policy must be based, in our view, on the development of four major scientific programs. These are: ecology and human health of people in the north; social and demographic problems of peoples of the north; structural policy in the north; and ecologically safe and resource-efficient technology and techniques for the north. The latter area will help cure a chronic illness. Today the proportion of machines adapted for the extreme conditions of the north is only 1 to 3 percent. Research shows that losses due to this reason amount to tens of billions of rubles a year. A draft program for machinery in the Russian north has already been developed. It would seem that its implementation would be possible on the principle of development of machinery financed by specific customers. In the process of conversion, this task is perfectly feasible. For example, northern models of aircraft are being developed, as are ice-resistant platforms for the development of oil and gas deposits on the continental shelf, small atomic power stations, and systems of radio-relay communications to service remote areas and settlements. The special conversion for the north program, within the framework of the statewide conversion program, will make it possible to finally deal with this issue.

One more thing, esteemed people's deputies: Until recently, research into the problems of the north has been the business of hundreds of academic establishments. Such a practice has led to the buildup of a large quantity of contradictory recommendations and decisions that are far from the real needs of the region. Proceeding from this, the government deems it necessary to create a scientific coordination center for problems of the north, the arctic, and Antarctica, and of the lives of minority peoples of the north. May I observe, by the way, that Russia has always been the recognized world leader in the study and development of the far north and the arctic. We should not cede the position we have won. The resolution of the region's socioeconomic problems will, as has already been noted, require considerable

capital investment and the involvement of all sources of finance. To this end, it would be fitting to set up a system for stabilizing finance in the north that would make it possible to modernize and restructure its economy. Evidently, one must agree with the proposals to organize local special innovation funds with the allocation to them of credit to finance special-purpose programs. As for foreign capital, direct technological investment in specific industries is, in our view, the most promising area.

A policy of state protectionism should certainly be conducted as far as the north is concerned—something that is done in all countries of the north. Of course, the scale and the form of the centralized support should be differentiated according to region, depending on the economic potential and the living conditions of the people.

There is no doubt that we cannot get by without state-administrative measures alongside economic levers in the transition to the market and in conditions of imperfect legislation. This also applies to fulfilling decisions about the north that have been adopted. The greatest concern is aroused by the implementation of the resolution on development of the economy and culture of minority peoples of the north. It should be admitted that many of the tasks defined in this, primarily as concerns construction of social facilities, were a failure in 1991. Supervision over fulfillment of this will certainly be tightened up. However, the document itself is imperfect. For this reason, the drafting of a state program to optimize the living conditions of minority peoples of the north has begun.

And finally, the resolution of the region's problems demands joint efforts of all ministries and departments. On the one hand, its special significance in Russia's national economy requires us to do this, on the other hand, the new state and legal relations being formed within Russia's economic space forces us to do so. Coordination is the job of the state committe for the north. So far there are plenty of shortcomings and omissions in its work. The government is examining proposals to enhance the role of the committee.

Naturally, the corresponding legislative base will have to be created to resolve the problems of the north. At present, a number of draft bills, including those mentioned in my report, have been prepared. We would ask the Supreme Soviet to speed up the adoption of them.

Esteemed People's Deputies! In conclusion, I would like to say that the outline and basic guidelines envisage the creation of regional programs as the foundation of the Russian program for developing regions of the north. Implementation of the latter will proceed in stages, depending on our economic capabilities as well as the scientific work on individual problems. Perhaps not everything will work out as expected. Nevertheless, we are convinced that in the final analysis, the implementation of this program will expand the role of the north as a potentially powerful factor in the rebirth of our state. To rephrase Mikhail Vasilyevich Lomonosov a little, one can assert that Russia's might will grow from the north. The government, esteemed deputies, asks you and the congress to support the outline and basic guidelines for the development of the regions of the north. Thank you.

Deputies Consider Draft Resolutions

LD2004072192 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0700 GMT 20 Apr 92

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, April 20 TASS—"Insufficient consistency in upholding Russia's foreign policy interests and the rights of Russians residing in other CIS states" is recorded in a draft resolution "On the Political Position of the Russian Federation in the CIS", drawn up by the Congress editorial commission. The document was handed out to Congress deputies here today.

Another draft resolution—"On the Status of the Black Sea Navy"—approves the decree issued by Russian President Boris Yeltsin on the Fleet's transfer to the jurisdiction of Russia, but suspends its third article on the hoisting of the St. Andrew flag on Russian warships. The draft obliges President Yeltsin to be guided by CIS documents during the talks with Ukraine, and also to proceed from the principle that the Black Sea Navy, though being under the jurisdiction of the Russian Federation, shall be placed under the operational command of the joint CIS Armed Forces staff.

Two different drafts were tabled on the Crimea. The "Russia" faction's document moves to rule null and void the 1954 decisions on the Crimea's transfer to Ukraine. The alternative draft, recognising that the Crimea's transfer was effected without taking into account the will of its population, only says that the peninsula's future "must be decided on the basis of the freely- expressed will of its people".

The Congress will discuss today a package of drafts, pertaining to Russia's relations with other CIS countries.

Details of Congress Discussion on CIS Reported

LD2004103592 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1009 GMT 20 Apr 92

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow, April 20 TASS—The Russian Congress of People's Deputies, currently under way here, discussed Russia's political standing within the CIS at its morning sitting today.

The speeches were most different, ranging from complete support of the CIS to charges of unpatriotism. After the debate on Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev's Saturday [18 April] report, the deputies are expected to adopt a package of documents today. It includes four

resolutions—on the ratification of the agreement to form the Commonwealth, on the state and prospects of Russia's political standing within the Commonwealth, on the Black Sea navy and on the Crimea.

Many deputies went on record for the perpetuation of Russia's geopolitical interests. In the opinion of Yuriy Zaytsev, who took the floor from the "Free Russia" faction, such continuity was ensured by the creation of the Commonwealth and that it would contribute "to the overcoming of inter-state anarchy". He called for Ukraine's tactful treatment, saying that a "Crimean tug-of-war between Russia and Ukraine" was impermissible. He moved to "render the peninsula economic aid so that it could cope with its problems".

Deputy from the "Democratic Russia Faction" Yevgeniy Ambartsumov urged the congress to reconcile itself with the collapse of the USSR as a political reality. He stressed that "even such a frail structure as the CIS was better than utter chaos". However, he did not share the excessive optimism of some deputies about the Belovezhskaya Pushcha agreements. Ambartsumov claimed that "we were then ensnared by utopia typical for Marxist-Leninist text-books".

However, the morning sitting was marked by sharp criticism of the decision to set up the Commonwealth. Ivan Rybkin from the "Communists of Russia" faction believes, for instance, that by signing the agreement on the CIS the Russian leadership had "trampled under foot the results of the March 17, 1991, referendum". Rybkin urged the congress to "adopt a declaration on the restoration of the Union's statehood".

This stand was shared by Pyotr Ryabukhin, who represents a group of deputies from Leningrad Region. He said the agreement to set up the Commonwealth was "a fiction, needed by the Russian leadership to oust the USSR president from the Kremlin". He also noted that "the Soviet Union's collapse stimulates the disintegration of Russia itself".

Svetlana Goryacheva, former vice-speaker of the Russian parliament, drew applause from many deputies by criticising the CIS agreement. She stressed that after the creation of the Commonwealth "Russia lost a part of its national territory". "The disintegration of Russia has already begun", she said.

Valery Shuykov, a representative from the Chuvashian Faction, was not as categorical as Goryacheva. He moved to ratify the CIS agreement, but criticised the Foreign Ministry for not having a comprehensive policy vis-a-vis the CIS states. He called for strengthening the Commonwealth "by setting up coordinating bodies". Shuykov believes it is necessary to "work on the formation of a confederation within the frameworks of the Commonwealth".

The discussion on the CIS will be continued. President Yeltsin is expected to meet leaders of parliamentary factions during the lunch recess, approximately at 14.30 [1030 GMT] Moscow time.

Deputies Recognize CIS

LD2004155292 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1530 GMT 20 Apr 92

[Text] Moscow, April 20 TASS—The Sixth Congress of Russian Peoples' Deputies recognised on Monday [20 April] the CIS as a "new legal and political form of a voluntary entity of sovereign states".

The recognition is proclaimed in the resolution "On Political Position of the Russian Federation in CIS" which was approved by a majority of votes.

The Russian main task in the Commonwealth is to broaden its legal basis, insure civil rights and freedoms of ethnic Russians living in other former Soviet republics, promote the preservation of a single economic space, avert conflicts and secure political, economic and military-strategic interests of the Russian Federation.

The congress authorised the parliament and government "to continue contacts with interested CIS states in promoting and developing coordinating institutes with the aim of carrying out agreed economic, monetary, fiscal and customs policies, and to draw republican legislation closer to each other".

The congress also adopted an appeal to citizens living on the territory of the former Soviet Union. "We are ready to improve the Commonwealth to make it a new form of a union of truly equal states", the appeal stressed.

The adoption of the documents was preceded by a heated debate. Summing it up Russian parliamentary Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov noted that the CIS "is yet a weak baby", "but if we want to preserve hope for its strengthening, we should support the signed treaties". The Commonwealth may develop along the confederative way, according to the speaker.

Russia is ready to accept "all forms of integration, confederation or federation which are suitable for our partners", Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev told the congress. The president and the government "are ready to constructively work for solving all issues together with the deputies", he added.

At the afternoon session the deputies discussed social and economic situation in the extreme north and similar regions.

The congress is expected to end work on Tuesday [21 April].

Further on Resolution

LD2004145292 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1400 GMT 20 Apr 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—The sixth Congress of Russian Peoples' Deputies recognised on Monday [20 April] the Commonwealth of Independent States as a "new legal and political form of a voluntary entity of sovereign states", but stressed that the level of integration in the Commonwealth does not correspond to the tasks of political, economic and military cooperation among CIS members.

The recognition is proclaimed in the resolution "On Political Position of the Russian Federation in CIS" which was approved by 548 votes in favour, 158 against and 136 abstentions.

The Russian main task in the Commonwealth is to broaden its legal basis, insure civil rights and freedoms of ethnic Russians living in other former Soviet republics, promote the preservation of a single economic space, avert conflicts and secure political, economic and military-strategic interests of the Russian Federation.

The congress authorised the parliament and government "to continue contacts with interested CIS states in promoting and developing coordinating institutes with the aim of carrying out agreed economic, monetary, fiscal and customs policies, and to draw republican legislation closer to each other".

The congress also adopted an appeal to citizens living on the territory of the former Soviet Union in which it proclaimed a course towards strengthening friendship of peoples in the former Soviet republics. "We are ready to improve the Commonwealth to make it a new form of a union of truly equal states", the appeal stressed.

Supreme Soviet Empowered To Prepare Address

OW2004191992 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1827 GMT 20 Apr 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The sixth Congress of the People's Deputies empowered the Russian Parliament today to prepare an address to the Constitutional Court, asking it to consider setting up of the presidential consultative council. The reason for the decision was the declaration signed by 300 deputies and read out at the congress which criticized the policies of Gennadiy Burbulis, Gavriil Popov and Galina Starovoytova, members of the consultative council. Deputy Vladimir Rebrikov who read out the declaration said that "they make statements in mass media, which are detrimental to the President and Russia's interests".

The recently established presidential consultative council is a permanent body which is to assess the expediency of the President's bills, decrees and decisions on key issues.

The Congress of the People's Deputies asked Parliament to reconsider the future of the Black Sea fleet and the legal status of the Crimea.

The draft resolutions on the transfer of the Crimea to Ukraine in 1954 call it "unconstitutional". They suggest that the people of the Crimea should decide their future, but none of the resolutions has been voted yet.

Yeltsin Meets With Factions Representatives

LD2004160392 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1400 GMT 20 Apr 92

[Report by parliamentary correspondent Sergey Medvedev at the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation in the Kremlin's St. George's Hall; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Here, backstage, general attention has been focused on the president's meeting with representatives of the parliamentary factions.

The question of Burbulis—I shall give him this very short and simplified appellation—echoed at this meeting, having arisen very suddenly at the congress. The desire was voiced by 525 deputies to hear this matter separately on the agenda tomorrow. They are indignant and concerned by the fact that the state secretary has usurped the right to draw up the principles of domestic and foreign policy, that is, has in part taken them away from the congress and from the Supreme Soviet. The very number, 525 of them, indicates that here at the congress there is a great deal of dissatisfaction with the personality of Burbulis himself. So perhaps the confrontation between the executive power and the legislators has not yet been finally concluded. That will happen tomorrow.

In his meeting with representatives of the factions, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin confirmed that a government reshuffle was inevitable: three or four people with practical experience, as he put it, will be brought in. No specific names were mentioned. What else was discussed? The CIS was, of course, discussed and Boris Nikolayevich was very concerned about the fact that the deputies just did not want to ratify the alliance. Nevertheless, it did happen and can be regarded as a small victory. In principle, regarding the question of South Ossetia, which was aired and yet did not get any further, Boris Nikolayevich said that he is ready to telephone Shevardnadze right away and to take part in organizing a quadripartite meeting between Russia, North and South Ossetia, and Georgia, on this question. As of yet, the deputies have come to no conclusions. At present the congress is continuing its work.

As for the results of the meeting with representatives of the factions, they agreed to meet frequently because it will be mutually beneficial

Yeltsin Concerned About Resolution

OW2004184792 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1826 GMT 20 Apr 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Russian President is seriously concerned about the discussion of the CIS and the resolution on the issue adopted at the congress of people's deputies. The news was broken by people's deputy of the Russian Federation, coordinator of the "Democratic Russia" parliamentary faction Vyacheslav Volkov. He was briefing a session of the parliamentary coalition in support of reforms on President Yeltsin's meeting with the leaders of parliamentary factions on Monday [20 April].

Volkov said the president fears that the congress's hazy attitude to the agreements concluded in Byelarus can arouse criticism on the part of some CIS member states and upset economic ties with them, in the first place, with Ukraine.

Yeltsin Wins 'Round Two' Against Opposition

PM2104091692 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Apr 92 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by Ivan Yelistratov and Sergey Chugayev: "Congress Has Refused to Adopt Draft New Russian Constitution as Basis: President Has Won Second Round of Contest With Opposition"]

[Text] The longer the Sixth Congress of Russian People's Deputies goes on, the clearer it becomes that all the disputes, conflicts, and disagreements there are based on a carefully planned attempt by the right-wing opposition to take revenge. Just as the role of the parliamentary speaker, who effectively headed that opposition, becomes clearer.

It ceases to cause amazement that Boris Yeltsin's former loyal comrade in arms has become his political opponent. After all, this is effectively a struggle for power, supreme power in Russia. Ruslan Khasbulatov was closer than anyone to that goal. Had he succeeded in his attempt to cause the government's resignation and deprive the president of additional powers and then enshrine the priority of parliament in the new Constitution, the president elected by all the people would have been transformed into a ceremonial figurehead whereas the man who won the speaker's chair only with great difficulty and thanks to a slim majority of votes would have become the real ruler of Russia. Thus Khasbulatov had something to fight for and reason to change his political orientation. However, having lost the first round to Yeltsin when the fate of the government was decided, Ruslan Khasbulatov seems to have lost round two on 18 April as well. Congress did not heed his appeals and did not adopt as a basis the draft new Russian Constitution proposed by the Supreme Soviet.

By all accounts, the earlier conclusions that a fragile equilibrium between the executive and the legislative is being achieved at the Congress proved somewhat exaggerated. Indeed, historical experience shows that when there is a power struggle in progress only temporary compromises between the rivals are possible. That was confirmed very graphically by the scandal enacted in the Kremlin early on 18 April even before the session began. As it has emerged, the day before, representatives of deputies' factions asked the president for a meeting. Boris Yeltsin agreed and a meeting was fixed for 0830 hours in the Kremlin. Arriving at the Kremlin at the appointed time, the president discovered to his amazement that he was to be joined in the meeting by Ruslan Khasbulatov and Sergey Filatov, his first deputy. Then Boris Yeltsin did the only correct thing in such a situation—he left the building.

Representatives of the president's entourage and the majority of observers regard the incident as an attempt to humiliate the president. However, it was the initiators of the attempt themselves who were humiliated. Furthermore, it is the general opinion that Boris Yeltsin's refusal to sit at the same table as the speaker demonstrated quite graphically that Khasbulatov's refrain-like assurances in recent days that his relations with the president are fine and that they are in contact several times a day do not correspond to reality, to put it mildly.

It is not impossible that the refusal to include in the draft Constitution an amendment on the right to buy and sell land was the opposition's final victory. It is interesting in this regard to make an on-the-spot analysis of figures which enable one to see just who these 406 deputies are thanks to whom Russia's peasants remain landless. The columns of names in the roll-call vote are littered with the abbreviation CPSU. People who at the time of their election were "oblast committee secretary, rayon committee secretary, soviet chairman, sovkhoz director..." Those who voted against the peasant's right to own land included 141 representatives of the top echelon of management (leaders at republic, oblast, and kray level), 182 representatives of the middle-ranking leadership (city and rayon level, kolkhoz chairmen, sovkhoz directors), 46 lower leaders, and only 16 workers and peasants.

It is presumably this top legislative power which will continue to lead Russia until 1995. It is becoming clear why Ruslan Khasbulatov tried with such determination to persuade Congress to adopt the draft Constitution as a basis. If that had happened, the model of the parliamentary republic would have been effectively enshrined. However, the Congress, according to R. Khasbulatov, undermined the authority of the Supreme Soviet and will not be able to continue resolving important questions of state life. It is that fact, the speaker believes, which is the consequence of the refusal to adopt the "excellently written draft" as a basis.

The Congress resolved merely to approve the general concept of constitutional reform and adopt only the main provisions of the draft proposed by parliament. But the most important point in the Congress resolution must be that the draft will undergo further work in the light of the president's suggestions relating to those chapters dealing with the federal legislative, the Russian president, and the Russian executive. In other words, those very sections which indeed distinguish the president's draft Constitution from parliament's. Thus there is reason to conclude that the president won the second round of the contest against the opposition, too. Furthermore, this time a very important victory was achieved considerably easier than against the government. This demonstrates that the opposition's ranks are gradually becoming thinner.

President Requests Right To Appoint Bank Head

OW2004184992 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1826 GMT 20 Apr 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The President of the Russian Federation has asked the congress of people's deputies for the right to appoint the president of the Central Bank of Russia and the chairman of the State Committee for Anti-Trust Polices and support for New Economic Structures. The President says if his proposal is accepted the Central Bank President and the Anti-Trust committee chairman would be appointed by the President with consent from the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. The congress is expected to examine the request on Tuesday [21 April].

Shakhray on 'Paralysis of Power' at Congress

OW2004185592 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1826 GMT 20 Apr 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Deputy Prime Minister Sergey Shakhray has told IF [INTERFAX] that the nil-to-nil draw in the struggle over reforms at the Congress of People's Deputies was a deplorable outcome. "Land has remained undivided, privatization has been slowed down and the government is left at the mercy of the Supreme Soviet", Shakhray said. He believes that the current situation is leading to the paralysis of power. Shakhray is disappointed with the fact that the congress refused even to examine the alternative draft of a new constitution. The draft was presented by a team of experts under Sergey Shakhray. "It was simply buried, although that was against the law", Shakhray said. In contrast to the First Deputy Speaker of the Supreme Soviet of Russia Sergey Filatov, Shakhray "is not certain that the congress will be able to exhaust the agenda on Tuesday [21 April]". On April 21 the deputies are to pass a law on amendments to the draft constitution, a package of documents on the North and settle a number of other questions. Asked whether the President would sign his resignation as Vice-Premier Sergey Shakhray said: "I think he would."

Poltaranin Interviewed on Freedom of Press

LD2004224692 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1419 GMT 20 Apr 92

[Interview with M.N. Poltoranin, minister of press and information, by correspondent I. Pankov in the lobby of the Sixth Congress of Russian People's Deputies; "Society and the Press" program—recorded]

[Text] [Pankov] The question of the mass media has been raised many times at the Congress, and television—both the First and the Second Channels—and newspapers have been accused of tendentiousness. How do you see this problem and the work of the press during the Congress?

[Poltoranin] Well, I think it is quite natural for these questions to be raised at the Congress. You were evidently at the Congresses of USSR People's Deputies, and as a USSR People's Deputy I attended every congress too, and I recall that this question was raised at every congress: Where is the press going? What is the press allowing itself to do? And the surprising thing is that these questions were raised just as forcefully as here. It is the communists, it is people like Aksyuchits and Astafyev and so on, people that is who want...[changes thought] who always had the press in their pockets, and as soon as the press started to climb out, to fall from their pockets, they try to stuff it back in again.

During the two years the ministry has existed, we have done everything to demonopolize the press. And I am glad that today, for instance, little depends on me, for instance, just as little depends on the president, just as little depends on the government, on the Russian Supreme Soviet. And in our country no one holds the reins to keep hold of the press or to rein it in. We have done everything to insure that no one can usurp the fourth estate, and I saw it as one of my life's aims—and still do—to bring it about that there should be a fourth estate.

And as for television not showing them the way they want, Ostankino, the Russian State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company, and the newspapers portraying them in the wrong way—that is quite natural, too, because after all, not everyone is saying they are being portrayed in the wrong light. They make up only one section of deputies. But the press is a mirror, not everyone shows up well, there are handsome people who like looking at themselves in the mirror. But not everyone likes to see their reflection in that mirror, all the more so if the face is twisted or distorted with a grimace of hatred or the thirst for revenge. And it is those masks that you will see on those people's faces.

[Pankov] The Congress decided to hand over this issue to the Supreme Soviet to resolve. What did you think of that?

[Poltoranin] I regretted it very much, because I was prepared to deliver a 20-minute address, and our ministry's position here is altogether unassailable, because the ministry works and always has worked within the framework of the functions confirmed by the Russian Supreme Soviet when I was confirmed as minister two years ago. The ministry has done everything possible to demonopolize the press, the ministry has done everything to help the press, and then people jumped up and down saying you give some people permits, others do not get them. We give permits first and foremost to children's publications, scientific publications, medical publications, to those cultural publications which make up the basis of our traditional culture, NOVYY MIR and OKTYABR, YUNOST. So I wanted to say all this, I wanted to say what has been done, and to show them the politics of the mass media and the way the issue was raised, because such an issue cannot be raised, they are two years late, because the Law on the Press was adopted two years ago: and the issue of politics, that is, of censorship, the issue of state politics in the sphere of the mass media, can no longer exist.

So I did have something to say, and I was very sorry that this issue was removed from the agenda. Because the fact that the fourth estate exists, whether people like it or not—especially the rightwing forces—must be recognized. And people must understand that in Russia today this estate is becoming—or rather, has already become—a reality. For we have gotten used to there being no CPSU, we have gotten used to Leningrad being called St. Petersburg, and the Congress ratified that. We have to get used to the fact that the fourth estate has emerged as a reality of life, as a fact. And when we have gotten used to this, then we must realize that the fourth estate is not simply the Bolshevik press that was like an errand boy at someone's beck and call, at whom one could shout and shake one's fist. No! Anyone who starts shouting at the press today will wreck his voice; anyone who starts shaking his fist at the press will break his arm; anyone who tries to suppress press freedom will suffer political death.

I must say this to everyone, and I must simply congratulate all of us that the present free press exists, that the fourth estate exists; and many deputies who did not want to admit this before the Congress became convinced of this through their own experience.

Rumyantsev on Congressional Role, Constitution

LD2004124192 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1217 GMT 20 Apr 92

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—"The Russian Congress of People's Deputies must exist for another year or two as a stabilising factor in our society, but it must by no means be engaged in law-making", executive secretary of the Supreme Soviet's Constitutional Commission Oleg Rumyantsev told a press conference today at the sixth congress's press centre.

Rumyantsev headed the team that has worked for two years on the draft of a new Russian constitution. Its main principles were approved by the congress.

According to Rumyantsev, the congress should increase the number of members of the Supreme Soviet to 500-600 people and should vest it with legislative powers. The congress, as a sort of people's assembly, should be left to hear reports by the president and ministers, to decide the principles of Russia's domestic and external policies.

We are now getting down to the finalisation of the draft constitution", Rumyantsev said. "this work will focus primarily on the definition of our forms of administration".

'Free Russia' Leaves Reform Coalition

OW2004190092 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1826 GMT 20 Apr 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The "Free Russia" parliamentary faction (A. Rutskoy's—IF [INTERFAX]) has said it is walking out of the coalition in support of reforms, which consists of the factions "Democratic Russia", "Left Center", "Republican Party of Russia", "Social- Democratic Party of Russia" and "Radical Democrats".

Monday's [20 April] statement by the "Free Russia" faction says that "the image of the coalition is forged by extremists". The faction accused "ultra-radical groups" of the desire to act on behalf of the whole coalition, which, the statement says, worsens confrontation at the congress.

The "Free Russia" faction declared its intention to form a constructive centrist bloc of deputies. It also called upon people's deputies to stay loyal to the democratic principles and "rebuff radicalism and demo-bolshevism".

Yeltsin Team Accused of 'Discrediting' Government

LD2004171792 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1604 GMT 20 Apr 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—The parliamentary faction "Civil Society" has accused several top officials from Russian President Boris Yeltsin's team of activities contradicting the interests of Russia.

The faction consists of 300 deputies, which is one third of the total number of delegates to the Sixth Congress of Russian People's Deputies.

In an appeal, the faction accuses Russian State Secretary Gennadiy Burbulis, presidential advisers Gavriil Popov and Galina Starovoytova and "others who share their positions and have influence on the president and the government" of statements and activities "discrediting the president and the government and contradicting the state and national interests of Russia".

The faction urged the Congress to "request the president to express his opinion about the political course of the above mentioned advisers and secretaries" and instruct the parliament to urge the constitutional court to consider "the constitutionality of some decrees by the Russian president".

Among them is a decree charging Burbulis with "developing and carrying out a political conception of reforms and the domestic and foreign policy of the Russian Federation" which is the exclusive prerogative of the Congress of Russian People's Deputies.

"The growing immorality is not surprising, because this process is being instigated by supporters of free politics, free from true patriotism, morality and responsibility".

The Congress voted to consider the appeal later and adopt a resolution urging the parliament to discuss questions raised in the document.

Factional Alignment in Congress Outlined

LD2004122692 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1100 GMT 20 Apr 92

[Unattributed commentary, from the "Novosti" newscast—read by announcer Irina Mishina]

[Text] Although a day still remains to the end of the Russian Congress and deputies may yet make important decisions, journalists already are summing up its results, and we are no exception. The first and main thing is that the Russian president has managed to push through his line and obtain approval of the current policy, at least until the end of the year. Second, the Congress unfortunately can no longer be regarded the authoritative assembly it was just a year ago. Third, the disposition of forces has changed and the parliament no longer can be divided simply into democrats and communists. New blocs and factions have appeared, while the Sovereignty and Equality group is not part of any bloc at all. The president has won a tactical victory during the Congress, but remaining above the battle, Yeltsin does not wish to withdraw, all the more because the victory of his government is, possibly, the beginning of a new stage of the political struggle in which there will be new opponents and new allies. At this moment, the Russian president is meeting with the leaders of parliamentary factions.

Meanwhile, this is what the political picture of the Russian parliament looks like today. Within the Bloc of Democratic Factions are the Radical Democrats, nonparty members, Democratic Russia, the united faction of the Republican Party of Russia, the Social-Democratic Party of Russia-Leftist center, and the Free Russia faction. The Creative Forces Bloc has united the following factions: The Workers' Union, Industrial Union, and Smena-New Policy. The Russian Union Bloc unites the Communists of Russia, the Russia faction, Fatherland, and the Agrarian Union. The Sovereignty and Equaltity and Civic Society factions have placed themselves outside any faction whatsoever.